

The South Atlantic Quarterly.

The South in National Politics.

BY WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN

Author of "The Lower South in American History" etc.

It is worth while, I think, to consider the South's present state, and its relations with the rest of the country, from a distinctly political point of view. I will not say that that point of view is the most important. Such a proposition few, perhaps, would venture to advance. But on the other hand not many thoughtful men, I suppose, would any longer take the opposite extreme, and dismiss politics as a subject to be neglected by those who are seriously concerned about the South's welfare. Politics are not negligible anywhere, and never have been. To neglect government is to be neglected or oppressed by government. Whether well governed or ill governed, we are in fact governed all the time; and the amount of governing we endure seems clearly to be increasing and not lessening. The scorn of politicians may or may not be justified; the scorn of politics is either uncandid or stupid.

The South, so far from having any excuse for indifference to the great and varied activities of government in this country, has if anything rather better reason than the other sections to be deeply and constantly concerned. Because of its belated development, it has exceptional need of the help of what may be called the constructive governmental agencies. Whatever one's view may be concerning the propriety of the government's undertaking at all such work as is being done by the department of agriculture, by the rural free delivery system, by the census and other bureaus that deal with statistics, or such as will be done by the postal savings banks, such, above all, as will be done by the trained men who will eventually be charged with the conservation of our still unwasted natural resources, one can hardly deny that the South offers to these enterprises a field peculiarly inviting because,

hitherto, peculiarly neglected. To be disturbed at the constant widening of the scope of government, at the way it is constantly entering more and more intimately into people's business and lives, is one thing; for a particular section to hold itself in any fashion apart, leaving the entirely general policies of government to be devised and executed by the men of other sections,—that is another and very different thing.

Let us consider a moment the sheer extent of the South's political isolation. Since the end of the Civil War—that is to say, for precisely half a century, lacking five years,—the South has had, except for poor Andrew Johnson's incumbency of an office whose powers he was not permitted to exercise, no President, no Vice-President, no chief justice of the Supreme Court. The headship of the national legislature is of course much less clearly defined than that of either the executive or the judicial department. But although the South has had since 1861 two speakers of the House of Representatives, one may say with assurance that no Southerner has for fifty years had any such power in legislation as Senator Aldrich now has or as Speaker Cannon had until recently. While Carlisle was speaker, his party was not strong enough to enact laws, and had no clearly defined policy. While Crisp of Georgia was speaker, his party did indeed for a time have both the presidency and a slight nominal majority in the Senate, but it lacked the strength or the virtue—or both—to carry out the mandate of the people and make a thorough reform of the tariff.

This is then the fifth decade since the South has had the headship, titular or real, of any one of the three departments of the government. Set that one fact over against the record of the first seventy-two years of the life of the Constitution, during which the South had the presidency more than half the time, the leadership in Congress at least half the time, and the chief-justice-ship six-sevenths of the time, and the contrast is striking enough; but the whole story is not told. Since the restoration of home rule to the Southern states, they have of course had their full numerical representation in Congress, but their representation in the other two departments at Washington has been pitifully meagre. Leaving out Cleveland's two administrations, they have had but five members of the cabinet—two in Hayes's time suc-

cessively holding the same office, one in the short-lived administration of Garfield, one for a brief service in Roosevelt's, and one now in President Taft's. Since two of these have been avowed Democrats in Republican administrations, their influence can hardly have been great. In the Supreme Court, two Southerners held on until about the close of the Civil War. Since their deaths, out of 28 justices who have served on that bench, the South has had five—or, if we include Justice Harlan, who is hardly a Southerner six. The average Southern membership, Harlan not counted, has been less than one. As to the relative number of Southerners in other offices, most of them, of course, lower offices than these, but many of them extremely responsible, it would be tedious to give the figures. Particularly significant, however, are those which show how little this region has to do with the representation of the whole country abroad. A very recent compilation brings out these striking facts:

"Of our ambassadors and ministers, not one is from a cotton State. Of our consuls-general, only three are from cotton States, and not one of these is stationed in a cotton-buying country. Of 333 men in the entire consular service, only thirty-one are from the South, Ohio alone is better represented in that service than all the twelve cotton States put together. The proportion of the Southerners in both the diplomatic and the consular service is but nine per cent of the total and the pay they draw but seven per cent of the total."

Even the fact that the South has had, since Reconstruction, its fair proportional representation in Congress, may be misleading. For the South has not had the actual weight in legislation which the fact might indicate. Southern men in Congress have not had as much power as men from other quarters. Most of the time, the party to which all but a very few of them have belonged has been in the minority. When it has controlled one house, it has seldom had either the other house or the presidency. The period I have already mentioned, when it did have a nominal control of both houses as well as the presidency, was very brief; it was also a time of panic and uncertainty and bitter factional divisions, so that little or nothing could be done. Moreover, whether in the majority or the minority, and whether as individuals or as a group, Southerners in Congress have not exercised such power as they did before the war. They have not seemed to feel that they had full freedom of initiative. Certainly, they have not often

taken the initiative effectively. If for fifty years there has been a single great general law or policy initiated by Southerners or by a Southerner, or which goes or should go by any Southerner's name, the fact has escaped me. Yet on the eve of the Civil War, when Hammond, of South Carolina, recounted what the South had done with the government, and challenged the North, then taking possession, to match the record, he was not making a false or empty boast. It would, no doubt, be too much to say that the South had controlled the government up to that time. Various policies the South opposed had in fact prevailed. But to make that claim for the South would be far more reasonable than to make it for any other section or even for all the rest of the country put together.

The change is therefore very great; one of the most striking to be found in the history of any country. Indeed, I am not sure that in any country there ever did occur such a shifting of power across geographical lines. Prussia's rise to the ascendancy in Germany so long held by Austria might be cited as a parallel; but that was fully accomplished only by Austria's withdrawing from Germany altogether. The South's present lot in the Union is also sometimes compared to Ireland's in the United Kingdom; but Ireland never had any ascendancy in the United Kingdom; Ireland has never before in all her history had so much weight in parliament as she has had under the second Asquith government.

Nevertheless, Ireland is discontent; and so should the South be discontent. Not, indeed, with a discontent that could possibly become disaffection. Far from that. With a discontent, rather, that should move in quite the opposite direction; that should demand, as of right, the blotting out of sectional lines; that should insist upon a full voice and a fair share in everything American—in all the activities, dangers, responsibilities, and in all the glory, of our prodigious American experiment; a discontent, in fine, that should not end until this union is perfect, as it has never yet been perfect. Such a wholesome discontent must of course begin its work with a thorough searching out of the causes of our present isolation; then turn to whatever can be done by way of remedy.

It will not quite do to say that there is but one cause, and that all-sufficient, and point to the African. That his presence among

us is the main cause, practically the sole original cause, will hardly be denied. But he was here during the earlier period also. What is more to the point in dealing with the matter practically, he is in all human probability going to remain here indefinitely. To concede that his mere presence is an absolutely controlling factor in the situation, or that the South cannot regain her lost equality in the Union without getting rid of him, would be to concede this present inquiry idle and hopeless. I prefer therefore to put it differently and say that the South's isolated and peculiar place in the Union has been the result of our way of dealing with the fact of the African's presence, of our way of dealing with him. To put it that way is, at any rate, more hopeful, more encouraging. Granted that he is here to stay, we may perhaps change somewhat our way of acting on the fact; we may perhaps find ways of avoiding some of the consequences we have hitherto endured. Let us therefore take that point of view while we consider how it is that the negro, occupying the place he has had and that which he now has in our civilization, in our life, has kept and still keeps us from entering more fully and potently into the life of the republic.

I cannot here even enumerate all the ways in which this general result has come about, and I cannot dwell at length on any one of them; but as a Southerner speaking to Southerners I can at least present candidly those which seem to me most important.

1. Because of the African, the South fought a fearfully exhausting civil war, and had to endure the natural consequences of defeat in war; for the fruits of defeat cannot ever be the fruits of victory. The flower of the South's young manhood perished in the conflict; and the great mass of Southern men who survived it were for some years proscribed. After such a war—so long and so ferocious—the losers would have been proscribed for a time in any case, no matter what the quarrel was about. The South can reasonably complain because the conquerers attempted to give political power at once to ignorant and utterly unprepared freedmen; it cannot reasonably complain because they would not give it at once to men who had been in arms against the Union and had so nearly destroyed it. That proscription is of course long since discontinued; but it would hardly be entirely accurate to say that the feeling of the North toward the South, cordial as

it has for the most part become, is even yet what it would have been if there had been no war.

2. The old divergence of the two sections, in institutions and habits and characteristics, which was a main cause of the war, and which was caused mainly by the African, still persists, and it will persist for a long, long time to come. This is not wholly regrettable; not at all. American life is more interesting for the variation, American character richer. There is much to be said for any kind of provincial differentiations that will hold us back from the tiresome uniformity towards which we are drifting, and which seems to be the bane of democracy, the penalty of what is commonly called progress. But we must admit, I think, that the continuing unlikeness of South and North, and the sense of that unlikeness which persists in both, goes some way towards explaining why, the North once having gained the ascendancy, the South has not, as the saying is, "got in" more rapidly and fully; just as that divergence was a reason why, when the South had the ascendancy, the North found it difficult to "get in."

3. One must also take account of the fact that the South has been, until quite recently, the poorest of the sections. The great fortunes and the great business combinations which have counted so powerfully, so much too powerfully, in government, have nearly all belonged to the East or the West. The tremendous political leverage of wealth has not been at the South's disposal. For this fact, the war and Reconstruction help to account. But the African is responsible; not merely indirectly, from having caused the war and Reconstruction, but directly also by his mere presence, by the effect of his presence on the South's economic and industrial standards.

4. Mainly because of the presence of the African, whether as a slave or as a freeman, the South has also been fearfully handicapped by a great mass of ignorance and illiteracy. I do not now refer to the negroes themselves, although they have been in this respect an appallingly heavy load to carry, but to the whites. I cannot here give the figures, and need not. Nor do I need to explain how first the slave, then the freedman, has been the main cause of the South's backwardness in education. That is well enough understood. It is sufficient at present to say frankly that one chief reason why the South has not counted for more in

national affairs is that, in any sort of competition, people with good schools and colleges have the advantage of people with schools and colleges which are not so good.

5. Mainly if not solely because of the African, the Southern mind has not been so free as the Northern mind; and freedom is power; certainly, the lack of freedom is weakness. To present fully this effect of the African's presence among us would require a book. Here, I can do little more than state the fact and appeal to every intelligent and candid Southern man's experience and observation, particularly if he has not always lived in the South, for the verification. Committed to a peculiar social order and system, to relationships of one man with another that hardly exist elsewhere in the republic, Southerners have felt their liberty of speech and action curtailed. Public opinion has been—perhaps it has had to be—tyrannous. To quote a very eminent Northern man, deeply and not unsympathetically interested in our problems, it has been "too unanimous and too oppressive." When our representatives have joined with those of other sections, they have been hampered with reservations. They have had to speak and act with constant reference in their own minds to what they have had behind them, considering national questions not solely in their national character but always with the restraining thought of their bearing on the peculiar situation. They have been less effective than the men of other quarters of the Union, because they have been less free.

6. Because of the African, the South has felt itself bound to hold together in an extraordinary political solidarity; a solidarity quite unexampled in our *ante-bellum* history, unparalled in English history. Again, I need not stop to explain how the negro has been the cause of this solidarity. All intelligent people understand it. Neither, I suppose, will many deny that it is in and through this long solidarity that the South's political isolation and impotence in the new Union has been most clearly, most definitely manifested; it is in this way that the South's isolation has been, as it were, sealed.

But the fact may be in need, for my present purpose, of some little amplification and specification. For my present purpose is practical. Ours is still a government by parties. However powerful independent public opinion and the independent vote may

have become, the actual work of governing is still done by and through the two great parties, and the South's solidarity has meant loss of power in government because it has meant loss of power in the parties. The South has chosen—or, if one prefers to put it another way, has been driven—to stake its political fortunes in the Union on a single chance. Committed to one party, the South has less power even in that party—less control, less consideration,—than it would have if it were not so committed. More still: If the South were reasonably divided, and felt itself as free as any other section to divide and discriminate between the parties, so that both parties could court Southern support with reasonable hopefulness, the South would have a far stronger hold on both parties than it now has on either. As things have been, one party has had no need to court Southern support, being sure of it anyhow; the other party, for the opposite reason, has found it useless to court Southern support.

This state of affairs has been, as I have elsewhere pointed out, bad for both parties and bad for the whole country. It has been bad for the Democratic party because the South, to which many of the ablest Democratic leaders belong, has been content to accept unfit party leaders and unsound party policies put forward by other sections; because, within that party, Southern public opinion has lacked independence. It has been bad for the Republican party because to the national leaders of that party the Southern situation has offered a constant and a too seldom resisted temptation to corrupt manipulation. The part played by Southern delegations in Republican national conventions has been for years one of the worst of our open political scandals. The situation has been bad for the whole country because it has thus deranged our party system and because it has meant the prolonging, for decades after the downfall of slavery, of the old evil of a divided household, of two unlike political orders persisting under the same government, for which slavery alone used to be blamed. Plain patriotism, therefore, should set all Americans against continuing things as they are. But I am speaking now more particularly to Southerners. And Southerners not blinded by prejudice must see that the situation is bad for the South, not merely because it weakens the South's voice in the Union, but also directly; that it is bad for the South apart from its concern in national affairs.

It is bad for the South, as I have already indicated, because of its effect on public opinion in reference to our own affairs. It makes for narrowness and bigotry, and against candor and independence. It has frequently caused, and may still be causing, persecution for opinion's sake. It is a situation which has constantly tended to restrain, instead of encouraging, the free play of intellect on subjects of common concern. It has therefore tended more and more to drive out of public life men of free and strong and independent minds and to give opportunity and power to men who, being themselves without real independence and manliness of mind and temper, have freely invoked bigotry and prejudice and intolerance to overwhelm manliness and independence in others. The South has thus been depriving itself of the leadership of its best and strongest minds and giving itself over to cheap men: cheap demagogues, cheap machine politicians, cheap partisan journalists. I repeat "cheap" advisedly; for it is the common characteristic of such men that, however costly their rule may be, they themselves, as the saying is, "come cheap." They make no conditions, no terms, but take power and office any way they can get them. On the other hand, it is the characteristic of men of the other class or type, of the sort of men whom this situation has so largely debarred from leadership, that they do not "come cheap." They do make conditions; and the one condition on which they absolutely insist is that in office or out of office they shall be free men: free to think and to speak what they will; subject to no tyranny whatever—not even the tyranny of public opinion.

These, then, are the principal ways in which the presence of the African, or the South's manner of dealing with him, has affected the South's political life.

The South's steadfast policy in dealing with him has been, as we all know, to insist upon the supremacy of the white race. It has also been the South's practice to set this purpose above all others; to consider all other public questions whatsoever not primarily on their merits but primarily in their relation to this question. Let us distinguish between these two things: between the main purpose itself and the subordination of other things to that purpose.

In its main purpose the South has been and is triumphant.

When we consider what the obstacles, the interferences, the dangers have been, that triumph becomes to the last degree impressive. Such another tenacity of purpose of a whole people, through a long series of years, through war, through defeat, through humiliation and poverty and weakness, the world has seldom seen. That will and purpose of the Southern people remains unaltered, unweakened. Within these last few years it has practically ceased to be opposed, to be even seriously questioned or reasoned with.

That is why I call attention to the distinction between the main purpose itself, now so fully accomplished, and the South's practice of subordinating to that purpose all other public considerations. For when at last we turn to the question of remedies, of the future, of the ways and means to deliver the South from the political state and situation in which we now find it, that distinction at once becomes important. The South has had its will, has won its fight. But the things we have been considering—the loss of power in the nation, isolation, and the rest—these together constitute the price we have had to pay for victory. Look at the whole matter broadly, and two facts appear as the obverse and reverse of the prize and medal of our hard-won triumph. One is, that we have succeeded in ruling the African, in controlling him well nigh completely. The other is, that we have nevertheless been ruled by the African; that we have been ruled and restrained and limited in our political life, in much of our intellectual life, by the fact of his presence.

Granted that we mean to maintain our supremacy, must we continue to pay so dear for it? I myself do grant that we mean for the present to keep the African substantially where he is in politics. It does not seem to me probable, it does not seem to within the range of the politically possible, that the South will at present grant him anything approaching political equality with white men. I am heartily in favor of gradually extending reasonable political privileges, as a recognition and reward of worth, to the best negroes. Now that the South is let alone, I believe this can be done safely if it is done cautiously, tentatively, watchfully, always and solely by the Southern people themselves. I sincerely wish they may do it; and to that end I sincerely wish that the negroes, by ceasing from their own solidarity, by acting

and voting as Americans rather than as negroes, may make it more and more seem safe to do it. But nothing will be done by the Southern people, within any period of time which we need now consider, that will endanger their control of the situation.

And nothing of that sort is any longer likely to be done by the North, or by the nation, against the will of the Southern people. That is a fact which deserves the strongest possible emphasis. For it is, in my judgment, a fact which marks the transition to a new period in the history of the Southern question; to a period in which we need not any longer be controlled as we have been—in which we ought not to be controlled as we have been—by the fact of the presence of the African among us; to a period in which, if we ourselves are not wanting in patriotism and in will, we may cease to be isolated, cease to be solid, cease to be politically impotent and negligible in national affairs. Northern public opinion no longer demands interference with our internal political régime. The Republican party no longer makes any real threat of such interference. There is not even any really strong faction in that party which makes such a threat. Southern Republicans, in those states in which they have any strength, have substantially if not expressly acquiesced in what has been done to take the African out of politics. The long menace is removed.

Let us therefore turn back to the already enumerated causes and fashions of our political isolation and impotence in the Union and see how, with this relief, we may hope to overcome them.

As for the surviving feeling of hostility or distrust in the North, we can best overcome it by disregarding it; by ourselves ceasing to entertain a like feeling, the chief cause and justification for which no longer exists; by this very policy which I am now advocating of coming out from our reclusion and entering more and more fully and heartily into affairs that belong to all Americans.

As to our mere unlikenesses to other sections in manners and habits and characteristics, we cannot at once or speedily drop them. As I have said, it would not be clear gain if we should. I for one do not wish to see Southerners become precisely like other Americans, any more than I wish to see New Englanders grow like Westerners or *vice versa*. But we may learn to treat these things as merely what they are—interesting and not in the

least unhealthy provincial variations, entirely comparable to the still more sharp and striking provincial variations of Englishmen or Frenchmen. We can simply cease to give to such differences any political significance or effect; and as we do that we shall, I believe, find other sections at least keeping pace with our tolerance.

With such weakness as we have felt from our comparative poverty I need not stop to deal. For that, happily, is disappearing. Our long gruelling in adversity seems to be nearing its term. We shall be henceforth in more danger from the political aggressions of wealth among ourselves than from outside oppression or arrogance because we are poor.

So, too, with our burden of illiteracy and ignorance. Though still heavy enough in all conscience, it is at least perceptibly lightening. Our people are aroused to the shame and the misery of it. There is still, it is true, much fear and dislike of the school-house for negroes. But a healthier sentiment and opinion grow apace. That wise leadership of the negroes themselves which has turned from unpractical and impracticable schemes of education to the sort of training which at present they most need, and which it is to the interest of the whites to give them, is making steadily for the sensible view of the whole subject. Our present most pressing need would seem to be the need of more thorough colleges and more fully equipped universities for the higher training of our chosen young men, our future leaders, and for clearer and firmer standards of admission and graduation. But that these things are coming, and coming fast, it is impossible to doubt.

It remains to deal with the oppressive habit of our public opinion and with our practice of political solidarity. I take the two things together because, when it comes to the question of change and a better usage, they stand together. The spirit that sustains the one sustains the other; and the spirit that overcomes the one will overcome the other. It is my belief that Southerners may now, without endangering the social order they have borne and sacrificed so much to maintain, assert the same right other Americans exercise to be of any political party they please, or of no political party, according to their individual convictions; and when they do generally assert that right Southern public opinion will soon cease to be the tyrannous thing it has been. The opportunity of

our present immunity once fully accepted, the fear and apprehension which has oppressed us once shaken off, we may and we should swiftly enter into our political birthright as Americans. No longer blindly committed to one political party, we may and should demand our reasonable share of leadership and control in both—or, if more should be added, in all. No longer hampered and held back by insecurity at home, our leaders of all parties may and should prove themselves at Washington as national, as American, as any others they shall there encounter. The South may and should rise again at least to equality with other sections in the Union, and confidently and hopefully assume at least an equal share of the noble burden of the destinies of the Republic.

Here is an emancipation which may well lift up the hearts and minds of us all; which may well mean a renaissance of all our finer forces; which might well stir art awake, kindle a literature.

To have done what we could to win for the South this release, to create this opportunity, has been the privilege of those of us who, coming to manhood after Reconstruction, have refused to inherit its bitterness. To make full use of the opportunity is now the richer privilege of those who, coming to manhood at what we fondly hope is the end of the entire period of the South's enforced isolation, shall refuse to inherit the habit of reclusion, the absorption in a single issue, the restraint, the weakness, which that isolation has entailed. It is the privilege, it is the plain duty, of the new generation to make this high resolve:

"Henceforth, though we be Southerners, and would not cease to be Southerners, we shall also be, in the fullest sense, Americans. Though we be, and must be, guides and guardians and therefore, for a time at least, rulers of this backward race which dwells among us, we will not ourselves be ruled by our own rulership. Henceforth, we will ourselves be free."

Science in its Relation to the Industrial Development of the South.*

BY LEWIS W. PARKER.

President of the Southern Cotton Manufacturers' Association.

When five years ago there was celebrated the centennial of this institution whose sons we are proud to declare ourselves, it was believed to be entering upon a new epoch in its history which would be even more glorious than its past. The laying today of the foundation of this science building and the construction of that lecture hall which we have in sight is but a fulfillment of these prophecies. In those *ante-bellum* days to which we often so proudly refer, this institution was distinguished for the character and learning of its instructors. But it must be admitted that the purposes and character of the instruction were not of that nature which we today characterize as practical. The courses of study were intended to a great extent to develop and broaden the intellect without any expectation that the mind would thereby be directed to any very practical consideration of the subjects discussed. The graduates of those former days became distinguished in the professions characterized as learned. In politics, in law, in medicine, and in theology they exemplified in their after lives the characters and the learning of those who had been their instructors; but in commercial and industrial pursuits but few attained distinction. Indeed, it can be said that such distinction was neither desired nor aspired to. In a measure the citizen engaged in commerce and the industrial arts, it matters not what was his character and ability, was looked down upon and did not stand upon the same plane as he who was engaged in the political work of the state, in agriculture, or in the professions.

In a series of lectures delivered by Professor Laughlin, of the University of Chicago, to the students of the University of Berlin upon "Industrial America", he points out a distinction between

*In substance, an address delivered on Founder's Day, January 14, 1910, at the University of South Carolina, on the occasion of the laying of the corner stone of the Science Building.

America and the European countries in that those social ordinances, which in the European countries kept men out of the trades and industries, did not have that effect in America; and that therefore the strongest, most acute, and most powerful intellects of the country were to be found in the service of production in America, whereas the social ordinances of those European lands had kept this class of men out of industries and trade. As Dr. Laughlin stated to the German students, the countries of Europe "may care more for traditions as to what is clean and what is unclean than for commercial success, but they must be willing to pay the price cheerfully". The South, and particularly South Carolina, in those *ante-bellum* days, in contra-distinction with the rest of the Union, did cherish the tradition of the clean and unclean and, as a result of this tradition, its ablest men did not direct their attention to industrial and commercial pursuits and did not regard these in their effect upon the growth and development of the community. The scientific instruction received, was not with a view to practical use in after life, but merely as an essential in the development of a broad intellect.

With the reverses of war these traditions of our Southland have been shattered, and there is a full realization of the necessity of education looking to the practical and looking to instruction in those arts and sciences which will tend to give to the individual a better opportunity to advance himself and with himself the community. With the re-establishment of this institution as an agricultural college in 1881, this change was first given an expression, and it became marked in the next few succeeding years in the establishment of professorships in various mechanical arts, including even those of wood-working and steel forging. With the political changes in this state, there came an arrest in this thought as applicable to this institution and a temporary restoration of it to those lines of thought which had distinguished it more than a half century ago; but again the continued industrial development of the state, the recognized need of men trained at home who might lead in this development, and an acknowledgment that the practical can accord with the ornate, have caused the thought of our people to revert to the impressions of the eighties, and to fit this University for the great work of which it is capable. This building, therefore, is to be an expression of this thought.

Providence has been beneficent in its gifts to this community. In climate we are temperate, without the extreme rigor of the North or the sultriness of regions further to the South. Our soil is rich, susceptible of the highest improvement and cultivation, as has been proved by the fact that in more than one product our state has shown the banner yield. In the proximity of the mountains to the seaboard, there is a fall in its streams which enables the development of a maximum of cheap power. On the mountain sides there is a luxuriance of vegetation not to be found in many other sections, and on the seaboard there are great phosphate fields furnishing those essentials for the replenishment of the soil incident to high cultivation. There are, therefore, all the essentials in our midst of great industrial development, and what is needed is the education and training of our young men that they may avail themselves of their opportunities. There is need of men to lead our people in industrial thought.

In agriculture we have but scratched the surface. Whilst we have shown the capabilities of our soil, we have utilized them but to a small degree. There will be conferred to-night upon one of our fellow citizens—an alumnus of this institution whom we esteem most highly—an honor coming to few men: the designation as a benefactor of his fellow men. If he be a benefactor who makes two blades of grass to grow where but one grew before, certainly is he such who makes many ears of corn to grow where none grew before. McIver Williamson has demonstrated the advantage to a community of a scientific knowledge in agriculture.

Another native of the same county of Darlington is demonstrating the possibilities of our soil and climate in the development of a character of cotton which, but a short time since, it was thought impossible to grow upon our uplands. D. R. Coker, another alumnus of this college, in cotton culture is doing for his state what McIver Williamson has done in corn culture. Without rejoicing in any degree in the misfortunes of communities whose culture of staple cottons has been rendered impossible by the boll weevil, we can well afford to avail ourselves of the opportunity offered, and demonstrate as Coker has done, the feasibility of the culture of this cotton on our uplands. Both of these men have applied in life that scientific instruction which they received in this institution.

The development of our water powers has opened a tremendous opportunity for industrial progress. Scarce fifteen years ago it was that in the city of Columbia there was inaugurated the transmission of water power by electricity for use in manufacturing. To-day there are being developed water powers of enormous extent which are transmitted to all parts of our state, offering opportunities for manufacturing hitherto unknown. In this development an alumnus of this college and a member of my own class, namely, W. C. Whitner, was most instrumental; and a graduate of our sister institution, the Military Academy in Charleston, W. S. Lee, has carried this development to its present great extent. These two men, in connection with the Dukes and the Wylies, also Carolinians, who whilst accumulating their fortunes in other communities are spending them with lavish hand in the states of their nativity in the development of their loved Southland, and who are entitled to recognition accordingly, have made water power developments of enormous extent. And yet the work of this development is but begun. On the Savannah river alone, which has hardly yet been touched in the construction of dams to control its power, there is enough water power to run every factory in this state. New uses are continually being found for electricity. We are wont to refer to that portion of our state including the counties of Spartanburg, Cherokee, and York, as the old "Mountain District". There is to be found iron ore of the finest quality and in great quantity, and limestone to be used in connection with the reduction of the ore. But on account of the absence of coal, this magnificent ore has heretofore proved of little advantage to our community. With the development of the water powers contiguous, and with the transmission of the electrical power so developed, with the substitution of electrical heat for coal, it is not without the range of probabilities that at an early date those magnificent ores may be availed of in manufacturing and a value now little suspected given to them. The old "iron district" may yet become the Bessemer of the South. South Carolina was an initiator in railroads. The electrical development may enable her to secure the advantages of her originality. Another alumnus of this institution, E. B. Anderson, is to-day the recognized authority in the United States on railroad motors, and occupies a commanding position in the offices of one

of the great electric companies. It is not improbable that the water power development may make possible a system of cheap transportation which will enable our products to be landed in commercial centers at most favorable and competitive rates.

In cotton manufacturing, the state has shown its greatest industrial growth, and quite a number of the graduates of this institution have risen to eminence in the industry. Yet the character of this manufacturing has been of a comparatively low order, and our mills have been content to manufacture that class of goods which requires the least skill, both on the part of the management and of the employees. Our product has been to a great extent carried to Northern markets for finishing and printing, and we have not developed these processes to any considerable degree. They require a scientific knowledge beyond that possessed by most of our manufacturers, and a field is open in the future for those possessed of such knowledge. In our cotton-seed oil mills we have been content to crush the seed and secure the yield of oil, shipping the oil to points north of the Mason and Dixon Line or to foreign countries for conversion into products commanding many times the value of the oil itself. In our fertilizer factories, we have been buying abroad ingredients which, it may be, can be successfully supplied at home. In all these lines, we have been content to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water," allowing to others the benefits which come from increased skill and greater knowledge.

The field therefore of the college in scientific instruction is not alone to give intelligence and knowledge to the individual for his own use, but to give it that he may use it for the benefit of his fellow men. The state has undertaken to give to all its children an education which will at least permit them to perform the duties of citizenship. In the establishment of a state university it is recognized that all of these children cannot secure the advantages of the higher education, but the state has nevertheless expended its income upon this higher institution, that a percentage, small though it be of the whole, may secure such advantages. But the object is not the gain to the individual, but advantage to the community, in that the graduate of the institution is expected to be a leader among men, guiding others and giving to others through the force of example the benefit of this instruction.

It is an interesting study, that of determining why certain industries have been successful in certain communities. Why, for instance, is Paterson, N. J., the center of the silk industry in the United States, or Trenton the center of pottery? Or why has Charlotte, in our sister state of North Carolina, become the Southern center of the manufacture of overalls? Or High Point the center in the South of wood factories? It is because in these communities some one leader, some one possessed of the necessary skill and intelligence, succeeded, and this led to others becoming interested in the same line of industry and likewise succeeding. The success of Gregg of Graniteville, and the subsequent successes of Converse and Montgomery in Spartanburg and Hamlet, and Smyth in Greenville, made possible the cotton manufacturing development in South Carolina; so the success of some graduate of this institution in developing the knowledge which he has gained here and applying it, either in the development of the agricultural resources, or in some manufacturing industry, may lead to such development of the community at large as may entitle him to be like our friend Williamson called "a benefactor of mankind." Each graduate of this institution obtaining here his scientific instruction, receives such instruction in trust for the whole community and discharges that trust only if he performs the services which lead to an advancement in industry throughout the state. In the autobiography of Joseph LeConte he refers to the pleasure he had in associating in the *ante-bellum* days with the leaders in thought in this state, and cites particularly Langdon Cheves, as one who, living in the quiet of a planter's life, yet was far advanced in scientific knowledge. He refers to a discussion with him in which Cheves, many years before Darwin wrote his "Origin of Species," had enunciated the same views as Darwin did in the same convincing manner. And yet with that reticence characteristic of the cultured gentleman of the time, Cheves gave no publication to those views, which were merely the result of his own study and reflection. As LeConte expressed it with reference to the Southern planters of the day, "nothing could be more remarkable than the wide reading, the deep reflection, the refined culture, or the originality of thought and observation characteristic of them, and yet the idea of publication never even entered their minds." Learned and cultured as were many of

our people in those days, but little is left in literature or in art today to mark their learning. The student of today, however, and the graduate of this day, will recognize the duty which they owe to the community to give back to it many times multiplied the advantages they have received at its hands, and the natural result of this institution, and particularly of this building, will and should be to bring forth a class of leaders who will develop all of our industrial resources.

A short time since, I heard a learned educator of this state refer to his idea of perpetual motion as being "that ceaseless flow which for nearly a century has caused the money of the South, earned by hard struggle in the production of raw material, to be continually moving towards other centers in payment for the manufactured articles developed from the raw material supplied by ourselves." If there is to be prosperity in the South, the future must bring a cessation of the flow, and we must retain at home these extra amounts which come from the development of our own raw material. In this work this institution, through its scientific instruction, will play a great part. In the recent inaugural address of President Lowell of Harvard University, he said: "When the young men see visions, then will the dreams of old men come true." If our young men can but realize the possibilities open to them, if they will but avail themselves of their opportunities, if they will but appreciate the responsibilities which are theirs, then will our New South be a land of plenty. I know in these days the New South is referred to by some in disparaging terms as being "commercial," but we can well afford, for one generation at least, to allow the commercial and industrial instincts of our young men to be developed, in the knowledge that thereby our section will be brought to much greater prosperity.

Ex-Slave Pension Frauds.

BY WALTER L. FLEMING.

Professor of History in the Louisiana State University.

Next to the "forty acres and a mule" swindle* the slave pension schemes have drawn more hard earned dollars from the ex-slaves than any other of the numerous frauds perpetrated on them. Unlike the "forty acres and a mule" swindle, which was contrary to the interests of the Southern whites and was therefore opposed by them, the pension fraud owes much of its success to the fact that influential Southern whites have favored slave pensions and have spoken or written or introduced bills in Congress to secure them, and numerous Camps of Confederate Veterans have proposed or endorsed the pensioning of faithful slaves. So the old negroes have felt that, after all the promises made, something surely was due them.

While the pension fraud is not one of the Reconstruction swindles, it is not of recent origin. The state of mind in black and white that made it possible dates from the returning good feeling between the races after the downfall of Reconstruction. There was some talk of it and some resulting swindling during the 80's, but the most important movement began with the early 90's and was not effectually checked for ten years. The former slaves were growing old, often too old to work, and the idea of pensions appealed strongly to them.

The immediate cause of the great swindling movement of the 90's was the activity of one man whose intentions, however mistaken, were probably sincere. This man was William R. Vaughan, a native of Alabama, a Democrat in politics, who removed to the Northwest and was at one time mayor of Council Bluffs. He was an eccentric person, probably ill-balanced mentally, and was possessed by two ideas: that the South was being robbed by the Federal pension system, and that the negroes by slavery had been robbed of proper returns for their labor. In order to right these wrongs he originated his slave pension scheme and between 1890 and 1903 secured the introduction into Congress of nine bills in succession. These bills were introduced "by

*See North American Review, May, 1906.

request" by Connell of Nebraska, Cullum and Thurston of Nebraska, Mason of Illinois, Curtis of Kansas, Pettus of Alabama, Blackburn of North Carolina, and Hanna of Ohio—all men of standing. The bills were identical, each one providing that ex-slaves should be made pensioners of the United States and that pensions should be granted according to the following scale: negroes 70 years old and upward to receive \$500 cash and \$15 a month; those 60-70 years old to receive \$300 cash and \$12 a month; those 50-60 years old to receive \$100 cash and \$8 a month; those less than 50 years old to receive \$4 a month.*

To push the bills in Congress several organizations were formed, the first of them by Vaughan himself, the others by tricksters who grasped the opportunity to gather a golden harvest. Vaughan declared that he formed his slave pension plan as early as 1870, but not until 1890 did he begin to organize his work. In 1890 he published a small book entitled "Vaughan's Freedmen's Pension Bill, A Plea for American Freedmen," which contained a sketch of prominent negroes, opinions of Vaughan and others about slave pensions, and a number of symbolic pictures, such as Justice giving reparation (pensions) to the blacks; negroes working in cotton, cane and tobacco fields, with this sentiment attached: "Southern products grown by stolen negro labor for over a hundred years;" a woman (the South) handing gold (Federal pensions) to another woman (the North); and on the inside cover a slave in chains faced on the opposite page by a picture of W. R. Vaughan of Selma, Council Bluffs, Chicago, and District of Columbia. This book was sold for one dollar to help defray expenses. The first edition of 10,000 was sold in one year, and several new editions were printed. In 1892 a large poster containing about the same matter was published. It also contained a picture of Vaughan and his five sons, all "pledged to plead that justice be done America's former slaves by the United States government and Great Britain."

The circular announced the organization of a secret order entitled "Vaughan's Ex-Slave Pension Club." The object of the club was to elevate the race, to act as a fraternal order, and to assist Vaughan in getting information about ex-slaves with a view to securing pensions for them. Any negro over sixteen years

*See Senate bill 1176, 56 Cong., 1 Sess., and House bill 11404, 57 Cong. 1, Sess.

of age could join, but, the circular stated, "no white person will be allowed to join said organization except it be a member of the family of the originator of the order." The headquarters of the society were in Chicago where Vaughan lived. Should any negroes wish to organize a branch of the Society they might, Vaughan said, send one of their number to Chicago "to obtain the secret work, grip, pass-word, etc. I will initiate such in the Chicago or Parent Lodge and give them full authority to establish such subordinate orders. For the present there are but two secret degrees. It is my purpose to increase the degrees within the next twelve months. The paraphernalia, masks, secret work, etc., for each subordinate lodge will cost \$25."

Numerous branch clubs were established, and the certificates of membership state that each person paid twenty-five cents entrance fee and ten cents a month dues, the proceeds to be used in pushing the pension bill. On all these certificates appear Vaughan's picture and the member's slave record, that is, the date of his birth, name of his master, etc. In 1897 Vaughan issued a circular denouncing by name individuals who were imitating his methods in order to get money from the negroes. He warned the ex-slaves that he was the sole author of the pension bill and that it was copyrighted by him; others claiming to be his agents were swindlers.

Until 1897 Vaughan's headquarters seem to have remained in Chicago, but in that year they were removed to Nashville, Tennessee. Vaughan, whose title had been Grand National Director, delegated his authority to one P. J. Hill to whom all records and secret work were turned over. In a circular announcing the change Vaughan stated that no persons would be "considered by me" or be entitled to any benefits under Senator Thurston's bill "without they hold a certificate" from Hill. A year later the name of the order was changed to the "Ex-Slave National Pension Club Association," and local clubs were notified that unless they sent in their dues they would be dropped. Agents were urged to push the work, to induce other ex-slave organizations to unite, and thus make a strong organization that could "make old Rome howl."

For several years Vaughan continued the work of collecting fees from the negroes and agitating in a small way the matter of

slave pensions. Rival societies gave him much trouble, so in 1899 to help in the work he established a newspaper called the *U. S. Department News-Eagle*.^{*} The paper had a semi-official appearance and name to which the United States authorities objected, and publication was stopped. In 1902 Vaughan's "Justice Party" appeared. The old organization had fallen into the hands of rivals, and Vaughan invented a distinctive title for his new order which emphasized the injustice to the South of the Federal pension laws.

In 1903 Vaughan succeeded in getting his pension bill re-introduced by Senator Hanna, and since then nothing has been heard of him. He expended, he said, \$20,000 in the pension work, but there is no doubt that he made more than he spent. The Commissioner of Pensions in 1899 estimated that he had collected \$100,000 in dues. Such was the history of the more honest part of the slave pension movement.

The other organizations were all fraudulent, designed merely to secure money from the ignorant blacks by the most barefaced misrepresentations. The most noted were the "National Ex-Slave Mutual Relief, Bounty, and Pension Association," and the "Ex-Slave Petitioners' Assembly." Smaller organizations were the "Western Division Association," the "Ex-Slave Pension Association of Texas," and "the Ex-Slave Pension Association of Kansas." In every Southern State there were also numerous local organizations, all formed by shrewd negroes to fleece their own race, and in addition to these there were numbers of individual swindlers not connected with any organization. Of all the swindlers the worst were I. H. Dickerson and Mrs. Callie House, two negroes who for several years conducted the "National Ex-Slave Mutual Relief, Bounty, and Pension Association." Dickerson was for a time one of Vaughan's agents but was suspended with others for embezzlement. He and the others at once organized a new society and with literature and blanks stolen from Vaughan went to work. They copied Vaughan's methods, detached his followers to themselves, and even used his name in their literature. The *National Capital*, later the *National Industrial Advocate*, published in Nashville, was their official organ. Mrs. House was the leading missionary of the order and was sent out to form

^{*}U. S. Department News-Eagle, Dec. 1899, Jan. 1900. Washington Star, Sept. 1, 1899.

branches. Unlike Vaughan, Dickerson and his agents often falsely represented that the pension bill had become law and that those who wanted pensions must join his order. Dickerson and Mrs. House were so reckless in their promises to the blacks that the Post Office Department forbade them the use of the mails, and the headquarters were then removed to Washington. Driven from there they returned to Tennessee, and then again went to Washington. So closely were they watched that they were unable to keep up their organization. At one time they claimed 600,000 members, old and young, each of whom was supposed to pay twenty-five cents entrance fee and ten cents a month dues.

The "Ex-Slave Petitioners' Assembly" of Madison, Arkansas, organized in 1897, was managed by three negroes. I. L. Walton, the secretary, published a paper called the *Ex-Slave Assembly*, in which he published regularly the old pension bills making it appear that they were laws. He announced that he had accepted the agency for the slave pension business and authorized his agents to collect from each member twenty-five cents and to forward each name with ten cents to him. In 1899 agents were authorized to collect money on the highway without organizing clubs. At that time Walton claimed 285,000 members, and in one issue of the *Assembly* he published the names of 130 travelling agents. Walton would himself enroll names at twenty-five cents each; to agents and others he sold constitutions and rituals at fifteen cents each. Agents were permitted to write letters for publication in the *Ex-Slave Assembly*, but when they were too long the writer had to pay for printing them. Walton was driven out of business in 1899 by a "fraud order" of the Post Office Department. The smaller orders sooner or later suffered a like fate.

Various methods were used in the field by the agents of these societies and by the local swindlers. Some of the agents were honest, but most of them were dishonest; the methods used and the results were similar. Each pension organization had numerous representatives who went over the South explaining to the negroes the pension scheme. Sometimes they represented themselves as agents of the United States Pension Office, and often without transgressing the law they managed to create the impression among the negroes that they possessed authority from

the government to enroll and receive fees from claimants for pensions. The usual procedure was as follows: an agent, usually a "professor" or a "reverend," went into a negro community, made a speech in the negro church to announce his business, and then proceeded to organize the ex-slaves into a club which paid \$2.50 for a charter, and each member paid twenty-five cents entrance fee and monthly dues of ten cents. A portion of the fees and dues was sent to the headquarters of the organization. In organizing the clubs the agent would show papers "with the District of Columbia seal which he said authorized him to do this work,"* would exhibit and read copies of the pension bills which he would say had "passed the White House," or had been read twice and had to be read only once more before it became a law. In Illinois an agent of the "Petitioners Assembly" warned the members that they must not "rite to the white house to find out," for it was like a "society," that is, secret. An agent named Butler Harris in North Carolina gathered together the ex-slaves, read a chapter from the Bible, prayed and then made the negroes swear on the Bible to give correct information in regard to their masters, their own ages, terms of slavery, etc. One rival pension organization was denounced by the agents of another. Much emphasis was placed upon the fact that some certain man, e. g., Vaughan, was the "author" of a bill, and held a "copyright" and that his company was "chartered" or "incorporated." Certificates of membership were given to those entitled by the bills to pensions. In North Carolina an agent told those who held this certificate that "it must be kept in their trunk" and not exhibited until the proper time; he represented his certificate as coming direct from "the Department." Some agents, especially those representing only themselves, offered reduced rates—one certificate for fifteen cents or two for twenty-five cents.

The promises made to the blacks were numerous and attractive. A North Carolina agent offered to secure \$75 within ten days for a fifty cent fee or \$100 for a one dollar fee, and for each additional dollar fee a \$100 extra pension. Those who paid no fees could get no pensions. A Georgia negro agent promised a uniform pension of \$12 a month for services from 1863 to 1865. The

*The quotations in this paper are taken from letters written by negroes to the authorities in Washington. These letters are on file in the Interior Department.

larger organizations insisted that the fees must continue to flow to headquarters until the pension "passed." One club of ex-slaves was informed that the "United States government was now ready" to pay pensions of \$4 a month to ex-slaves under fifty years of age and \$8 dollars a month to those over fifty years of age. A North Carolina ex-slave wrote to President McKinley that a man had promised his "society" that for twenty-five cents each he would write a letter to the "Pension Department" which would then send them \$200 dollars each and a monthly pension afterwards. A "ginger-cake nigger" in Virginia called on the sick and helpless ex-slaves and convinced them that for a fee of one dollar he could secure \$200 outright for each man and \$50 for his wife.

Great show was made by the swindlers of making out and carrying away full records of the ex-slaves. The local clubs also were required to keep records and to send transcripts to headquarters along with the dues. Some of the record books were sent to Washington by United States officers. It is not a pleasant experience to look over the long lists of names, with the attached records of age, master's name, old slavery name, etc., and the pitiful accounts of the ten cents monthly dues which were often paid for years. Of three books that the writer examined one had 110 names, another 293, and a third 330. Some lists of members, it is said, ran into the thousands.

Most of the pension orders distributed printed constitutions and rules, with suggestions for exercises at the meetings of the local clubs. Poems on slavery and "ex-slave pension songs" found a place on the program of the meetings. The various pension bills were read each month and explained. To keep the clubs together the "Mutual Relief, Bounty, and Pension Association" and other similar organizations sent out quantities of literature to inform and excite the negro members. This literature consisted of circulars containing reprints of the pension bills, statistics of the amounts due the ex-slaves, pictorial histories of the pensions movers—Vaughan, Dickerson, Callie House and others—statistics of membership, and denunciation of rival organizations. In some sections, notably in Tennessee and in the District of Columbia, conventions of pension seekers were held under the supervision of the agents. At these meetings the exer-

cises were calculated to incite those present to a firm belief in the certainty of slave pensions. In Tennessee posters were sent among the blacks announcing the forthcoming conventions, the programs, and speakers. Barbecues were held on convention days, and the harvest from the new members was great. The pension bills were always read, and very few negroes knew that they were not really law. One negro preacher said "I was in a meeting in New Bern, North Carolina, where there were over 400 people, and the Thurston bill was read and every one in the audience except myself believed it had already passed. Those in charge of the meeting collected money and the people gave it freely—forty cents a head."

The swindlers met opposition from the better class of negro preachers and teachers. Consequently in their speeches and in the advertising matter sent out the pension people warned the negroes that they must expect opposition from preachers and teachers who were in league with their enemies. One report asked for by the Dickerson-House people from the local clubs was for the names of "ministers, teachers and other prominent negro opposers." The Interior Department has in its files many pathetic letters from preachers asking the government to do something to stop the frauds which were not only making the black people poorer, but were injuring the work of the ministers and teachers. The advice given by the pension agents against the influence of the preachers and teachers often had serious results. Schools were broken up because the teachers pronounced the scheme a fraud. Negro ministers lost popularity and influence; churches were divided and sometimes ruined. One agent told the members of one church that the minister's opposition had delayed the pension, and the minister reported that as a result of this statement "a great many refuse to tend church on that account," and that "these poor people reads only one paper—the *National Capital*, said paper is almost run some of them crazy." A Tennessee preacher demanded that the movement "be nipped in the bud" for it was "a Robbery." The letters show that the negro ministers withstood temptations, suffered persecutions, and made material sacrifices in order to check this robbery of their people.

The young negroes also often opposed the movement. The old negroes were instructed to expect this attitude from those who would not profit by slave pensions. Usually it was ordered that

whites be not consulted; agents only must be dealt with. Whites who denounced the movement were to be considered enemies of the race and boycotted. A circular sent out by Dickerson and House stated that opposition had been encountered from ministers, politicians and teachers which only proved that these men were "enemies to the race, fakes, and frauds" and that while education is "grand" it is "dangerous for fools to have." One minister wrote: "I got the floor to explain to the people that they were being deceived, and I got in some dispute with the parties and had to get out a warrant and have them arrested for obtaining money under false pretenses."

The pension movement resulted in a considerable correspondence directed by ex-slaves to Presidents Cleveland and McKinley and to the Pension Bureau. Many of the letters excite a reader's sympathy, for they frequently lay bare quiet tragedies and always pitiful anxiety. A Louisiana teacher wrote that he wanted a job to look after the ex-slaves who were to get pensions under "Senator" Hanna's bill. A petition signed by 110 Alabama negroes and sent to McKinley states that "we old people are Whoring [worn] out, no good in us now...[we are] praying god to open the heart of each congressmen"...[for] "if any race need pension we do need them bader than any Race under the Sun." Another letter stated that "ther was a agent saying that the presentdent sent her around saying for them to pay 25 cents...and she got a good many Siners [signers]." A Kansas City negro wanted "sum idea of this great Bill now pending known as the Pettus Bill no. 1176 of Alabama." One old Georgia negro wrote that a man had gotten his "pension papers" some time before and fearing crooked dealing he instructed the President to "pleas hole them" when presented. The officers of a pension club wrote to get news of the pension bill, stating that 293 ex-slaves "have pade theare 25 cent for thear stiffacate." A Florida preacher said that "the report did cause a many pore ex-slave heart to rejoice with fals Joy for his Pension." Reuben McCoy of Woodlawn, Alabama, was disgusted with Dickerson and Vaughan. "I have got tired," he wrote, "of so much foolishness...of state celisiters and treasure holders," who promised pensions which never came. In 1898 a delightful letter came to Mr. McKinley from Tennessee. "I will set down to Drop you a few lines to let you here from me I

am will at this time and I hope when this Reach you I hope it will find you and all of your family Doin Will...I am agent for your Life and Distinguished Services and know your wife's name," and he wanted news of his pension. A letter from Sparta, Illinois, is typical of many received by McKinley from old negroes. It began with the usual polite expressions: "It is with much pleasure that I write you a few lines to inform you of my health I am well & hope you are the same." He had heard of the pension law and suggested to McKinley that "you might send me a couple of dollars" in advance. He lived "in a little old Cabin... [and] it rains in same as if there was no roof...I am eighty-four years old,—stove up with old age and rheumatism."

So great was the interest of the colored people in the proposed pensions and so wide spread were the fraudulent operations of the societies which claimed to be working for the ex-slaves that the Pension Bureau took steps to disabuse the minds of the old negroes in regard to the matter and to check the illegal activities of the pension agents. Information was given to the press generally, and especially to the colored newspapers, to the preachers, teachers, and prominent men in the districts infested by the swindlers. Beginning in 1896 circulars were sent to all negro men known to be active in the slave pension business warning them against representing themselves as agents of the government or saying that the slave pension bills had become law. Agents who pretended to have official authority would be prosecuted under a law of 1884 which made it a crime to pretend to be an officer of the United States. This action of the Pension Bureau had at once a distinctly good effect. A person like Vaughan hastened to make clear his aims which heretofore had been vague and misleading. Some of those who had been claiming official authority ceased to do so, others quit the business.

In answer to circulars some amusing letters were received. One agent of the "Ex-Slave Petitioners' Assembly" wrote in reply that his business was official and perfectly legitimate and requested the pension authorities to strike off for him a lot of circulars containing the seal and endorsement of the Bureau. Many wrote stating that they had believed themselves to be authorized by the government. An agent of the Vaughan movement wrote: "If I have been wrong in receiving money in this way the National

Convention that was held in Nashville is wrong." This agent in 1897 was still basing his work upon the Connell bill of 1890. One man wrote to McKinley that he had "Rec'd a nice letter from the law division" (of the Pension Bureau) and evidently felt flattered. A Georgia negro was alarmed and sent an urgent request: "please don't authorize an officer to accompany me to you, just send me word an I will go as strait to you, as a babe to its mother."

But the swindlers though checked were not stopped. The United States authorities in order to prevent fraud by pretended officials sent officers to the ex-slave meetings to watch the agitators and to arrest those who claimed to have authority from the government. The Pension Bureau has record of eight or ten convictions in United States courts, and many more were secured in state courts. This action practically stopped the illegal frauds, but the worst swindlers were now operating inside the law—collecting money under the pretense of paying the expenses of organizing the ex-slaves and pushing pension bills in Congress. The leaders in this were again Vaughan, Dickerson, Walton of Arkansas, and Callie House, with two new ones, T. Starr Murfree in Tennessee and A. A. Washington in Mississippi. To put an end to the schemes of these people the aid of the Post Office Department was asked, and "fraud orders" were issued against all of them. As a result none of them could continue his business through the mails. It was a deadly blow, and only Dickerson and House survived it for any time. They changed their addresses several times and tried to work through the express companies, but finally they were, it is thought, driven out of business. As soon as a money collection scheme based on the slave pension idea was heard of, the receiver of the money was "fraud ordered" and the old negroes then kept their dimes and quarters. Much credit is due the officers of the Interior and Post Office Departments for their persistent efforts to run the swindlers out of business.

A remarkable feature of the business is the ease with which the members of Congress were unknowingly made to lend their aid to these fraudulent schemes. Between 1890 and 1903 ten bills were introduced "by request," and not until 1899 did any one call attention to the bad results of such bills. In December, 1899,

when Senator Pettus introduced an ex-slave pension bill, Senator Gallinger of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Committee on Pensions, declared that such bills were harmful because they deluded the negroes and subjected them to fraud. Senator Mason, who had once introduced the same bill, then said that he was convinced that bad use had been made of it. An "immense correspondence" from all over the South proved to him that it had resulted in fraud. Senator Thurston made a similar statement as to the results of the bill introduced by him; he said he had received about 2,000 letters indicating that the bill had cloaked a scheme of fraud. Upon this information and upon a mass of facts presented by H. Clay Evans, Pension Commissioner, Senator Gallinger in January 1900 made a strong report exposing "the mischievous features of the movement" in order to prevent the introduction of more such bills. Senator Hoar, however, unwittingly used a few expressions which seemed to show that he favored the principle of the measure, and thus unfortunately further swindling was aided. In 1903 Senator Hanna re-introduced "by request" the same hoary bill, and with copies of its windlers at once descended upon the black South.

Since 1903 there has been little visible evidence of renewed ex-slave pension frauds. It is not illegal and cannot of course be made illegal to organize ex-slaves and advocate slave pensions and collect money to push the pension bills, but the literature and correspondence of the pension agitators cannot be carried on through the mails. Some swindling probably still goes on and will continue as long as any number of ex-slaves are alive. This, however, is done by individuals with no organization behind them. One of the last cases in which the United States secured a conviction will illustrate the utter meanness and the tragedy of the business. An old negro woman living near Norfolk, Virginia, had saved her money and purchased a house, lot and well stocked chicken-yard and pig-pen. One spring evening about dusk she was sitting in front of her house resting after the day's work. A well dressed negro man came to the front gate, fired a pistol three times, and marched up the walk to the house. "I am an officer of the United States," he told the old woman, "see my white pants, see my blue coat, see my pistol. Magnum!" All of which impressed the old colored woman, especially the fre-

quently repeated word "Magnum," which she thought had a magic meaning. The negro then announced: "As an officer of the government I am entitled to free board at your house, to have fried chicken and waffles for supper and clean sheets on the bed." So he was established as a boarder. The negro woman being an ex-slave, her boarder offered his services to get her a pension. She was on the records, he said, to get lands in far off Arkansas and also to receive \$700 in gold, but to get the latter she had to prepay the "freight" which amounted to \$90. A mortgage secured the \$90. The pension agent lived on the best the woman could give until she became nervous about the \$700 in gold. Then he discovered that a slight mistake had been made. She was due \$1800 in gold without any western lands, but the "freight" was \$250. A second mortgage secured this, and she went with him to a public telephone, heard him drop the money in, as he said, and ring up the "Department" which would send, he told her, the \$1800 as soon as the "freight" tinkled in the telephone. Since he had consumed the entire substance of the old woman, he now left. When the United States authorities caught him he was given ten years in the penitentiary.

A Little Experiment in Enforcing a Fourteen-Unit Entrance Standard.

BY HENRY N. SNYDER,

President of Wofford College.

For now twenty years one organization in the South has stood for something like real college standards based upon a proper amount of high school preparation. One might almost say that the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges took for its motto the phrase, "This one thing I do," that is, to insist upon the differentiation in quality and quantity of high school and college work and to relate the latter to the former. The main trouble with the efficiency of the Association has been that its field of usefulness has been too limited; only a comparatively few colleges have felt that they could meet its conditions and conscientiously put into practice its regulations. Most institutions, therefore, went on in the conviction that they could best serve the educational ends for which they were established by adapting themselves to the immediate needs of their own constituency. So each, independently, preferred to work out its own problems in its own way.

This did not mean, however, that the Association was not a good thing, that its causes were not right causes, and that its theory, applied in practice by the few, should not one day be applied by the many. Indeed, it is probable that the most of us were grateful that such an Association existed,—existed if for nothing else than to hold up, so that we should not forget them in our efforts to introduce order into the educational chaos, high ideals of educational relationships and values. In the confusion—an unavoidable confusion—college and secondary school work were mixed to such a degree that, according to the best standards, most colleges were simply trying to use college methods and the college spirit upon depressingly raw high school material. Nobody was satisfied with such conditions; certainly nobody worth reckoning with wanted or expected them to go on indefinitely. Adaptation to them was looked upon as merely a temporary, but necessary, expediency. All who had any conscience in the matter

somehow could not escape the discomfiting feeling, as we viewed the slaughter of the innocents in the four years between freshman and senior, that we were *particeps criminis* in a kind of educational crime. If we held to college standards, our business was a distressing tragedy from beginning to end, and the fit few who survived hardly compensated for the unfit many who, educationally, perished along the way. It seemed to some of us anyway, as we considered the killed and wounded, that what we regarded as one of the most constructive agencies of human betterment we were turning into one of the most destructive, so great were the losses.

But what should be done? As we faced conditions as we knew them really to be, we might have said something like this: "Well, the old academy has at least temporarily ceased to exist; to it we cannot look for material; the public high school has not yet been developed, and the common schools are, as a matter of fact, just in the making; from them, however, we get the most of our students; but we know that they are not prepared to do college work as we understand it. Which is the better, to subject them to a process of training for which they are not ready, or to adapt our methods to their needs?" As we searched our hearts we knew that educationally the latter was the sounder thing to do. But we did not do it, and there was never any danger of our doing it. To take a college or university plant, with all its equipment and resources, and its university-trained teaching force, and apply it frankly as a high school, and say so, is simply unthinkable! On the other hand, we could have said: "We are a college in fact, and we mean to conduct our institution as such, students or no students; this we shall do because of what we owe not only to ourselves but also chiefly to the students and to the public whose servant we are. This public will witness the spectacle of educational institutions without students, and no doubt will withhold gifts and appropriations. But in the meantime we shall be teaching them a great educational lesson, and they will hasten, by both private initiative and legislative enactment, the establishment of a high school system." And this, too, we did not do, and there was never any danger of our doing it. It would have been too costly in money and students, and we should have seemed disloyal to the immediate educational interests of the public we were trying to serve, however our own professional conscience might have been comforted.

What we did do was mainly of the nature of a compromise. Possibly this may have been the best thing to do under the circumstances. But the danger was in our getting so used to compromise measures as to accept them for those permanent educational principles which we had abandoned, as we thought, but temporarily. From this danger, however, we have been saved by the call of the "units". A few years ago a new force, the Carnegie Foundation, entered the field of higher education. This, for at least several very important reasons, had to be reckoned with. In the first place, it proved to be a searchingly scientific investigating agency,—an agency that published to the world the results of its investigations without regard to the traditions, the age, the standing, real or assumed, of any particular institution. It had, moreover, a clearly defined standard of what constituted college work and of what constituted high school work, at least quantitatively, and, being absolutely independent, it did not hesitate to classify institutions accordingly. We thus saw ourselves as others saw us, others, too, who saw with the eyes of experts, and who therefore spoke with authority. This view served to make us exceedingly uncomfortable, and we got very busy talking, re-arranging, re-adjusting in terms of "units", particularly fourteen of them. For a time it looked as if our whole educational salvation hung upon whether we could get them and get them quick.

In counting up units for entrance, institutions are not greatly to be blamed if they strained themselves just a wee bit, for so much depended upon them. Hitherto the standing of institutions in polite educational society was governed by what they called themselves, college or university, not by what they really were. Now they were all shocked by a rating which threatened, in a way, to declass them. They were naturally brought up standing, so to speak, and were not a little astonished to find where *they were at*. Moreover, the fact that there were generous awards in the way of pensions in these magic fourteen units, certainly did not make college and university faculties any less zealous in their sums of entrance addition. Neither would it be entirely just to blame them if their new zeal for higher standards made them forget, for a time anyway, the conditions by which they were surrounded, and rendered a bit feeble their sense of

loyalty to their constituency. Human nature has to be reckoned with even in college faculties.

The influence of the Carnegie Foundation was naturally, at first, what we might properly describe as over-stimulation in the matter of entrance requirements. But most institutions have by this time entirely recovered from this, or are at least on the road to recovery. Still no self-respecting institution can now get away from the obligation to separate college work from high school work just as rapidly as it can be done. Thus the Carnegie Foundation is hastening what the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges has been long trying to do, with distressing slowness, however. The influence of the former coming just when it does, seems a kind of educational providence, not, as some might think, to the professors in favored institutions, but to the new high school movement now going on at the South. The success of this movement is almost as much dependent upon the standards of entrance honestly maintained by the colleges, as it is upon legislative enactment and local taxation. In some states appropriations to high schools are conditioned on the number of pupils, and few towns will maintain high school departments unless there is a sufficient number of students to make it seem worth while thus to spend the people's money. For colleges and universities to step down into the eighth and ninth grades of these schools and take their pupils can no longer be justified on any grounds whatsoever. If it was ever right to do this, it cannot be so now. Thanks to the tonic and clarifying influence of the Carnegie Foundation, stepping in just at the nick of time, so to speak, we now know clearly that the college or university that does this is the perpetrator of an educational wrong, not merely to the student himself, but to the solid success of a very inspiring movement for the betterment of all the people. At last every college worthy the name must relate itself in a kind of organic way to the movement, and least of all can any institution of higher learning, supported by public taxation, confuse its practice with mistaken notions of duties which seem to be in the direction of continued low standards. One might think, for example, that a state university fulfils its truest mission when it keeps the high schools standing a tip-toe to reach its entrance requirements. In the long run such an attitude is better than swarms of students and largesses of appropriations.

With these general considerations as a background, let us see what came of a little experiment to enforce rigidly a fourteen-unit standard in a typical southern college in the year 1909. This college has had pretty fair traditions of scholarship and the reputation of doing at least not a bad sort of work. Up through 1907 students were liberally admitted on (say) 8.5 units, that is, after they had finished the ninth grade, or rather perhaps after they had gone through their neighborhood schools, whatever the grade. In 1907 one hundred and four freshmen were admitted. Of these just seventy-two survived to the end of the session. More than thirty per cent were thus sifted out. This rather wholesale slaughter, though no more than usual, set the faculty to thinking. They had thought before, no doubt; but conditions were not so favorable, due to the causes I have already indicated, for really discriminating thinking. They came to the conclusion that something was wrong,—the preparation of the students, the methods of the college, or their own teaching. This last they dismissed, of course, at once,—that there should be anything wrong with their teaching. They finally settled on the right wrong, so to speak,—the inadequate preparation and the consequent immaturity of the students. Thirty per cent was too dear a price to pay even for the look of a hundred and four freshmen in the catalogue. So the faculty conscience began to work, as it sometimes does, with the result that they resolved to apply strictly, in 1908, a 9.5-unit standard. This was done, and what happened? The freshman class was reduced before entrance to eighty-four, twenty less than the previous year. What else happened? At the end of the session there were seventy freshmen who survived, and the most of them in fairly good shape for the sophomore class. Thus, with an entering class of eighty-four the session closed with only two less than with the class that entered with a hundred and four. Moreover, everybody was enthusiastic over the quality and quantity of work done. In a word, from the standpoint of the college, the experiment was a success. But what became of those students who were refused admission? Some entered the high school maintained by the college; others went back home to prepare themselves further; and a few, alas! entered other colleges to be educationally maimed for life.

The authorities of the college found the strict application of a

9.5-unit standard so very satisfactory that they could not resist the lure of a fourteen-unit standard. So they announced for 1909 this requirement, allowing, however, conditions to the amount of four units. In addition to this they determined not even to examine a man who had not completed at least the tenth grade. In the correspondence during the spring and summer, student after student applied from the ninth grades, and, when told that they could not enter, in many cases they frankly said they would go to other colleges, and they did. Moreover, in every case where there was an eleventh grade, the student applying from the tenth was advised to remain at home to complete the eleventh.

Now what were the results of the experiment? Only fifty-two were admitted to the freshman class, a reduction of thirty-two, forty per cent, from the number entering the preceding year. This rather drastic sifting may be taken as evidence of the thoroughness with which the fourteen-unit standard was applied. Precisely twenty-one of this fifty-two were admitted without conditions, one as an irregular on account of his age, and thirty, sixty per cent of the class, with conditions. In the next place, it is worth noting that twenty-five of this class came from the public high schools, nineteen came from four private high schools, and eight from college freshman classes. Moreover, the thirty conditioned students each had some language conditions, five with four units, five with three, twelve with two, and eight with one.

These, then, are the facts in a strict enforcement of a fourteen-unit standard in a typical southern college in the year 1909. What conclusions may reasonably be drawn from the facts? First, consider the eight students from the freshman classes of other colleges. Each brought letters of honorable discharge; as far as could be learned there was nothing against the conduct of any one of them. The scholastic record of each, however, showed that he had failed in some one or more studies of his freshman year. This probably accounts for his changing institutions,—that he could not make his class, and, if he had to repeat, he preferred to do it at another college. But may not a letter which one of them brought from his hard-headed, practical, unacademic father who was more concerned with the education of his son than

he was in getting his name on a college roll give us a hint of something else? This letter ran in effect this way: Put him in the high school if necessary; all I want is that he be able to do college work successfully. We had ten grades in our local school. He had only finished the ninth; but was extremely anxious to go off to college, and when he received encouragement from the president of X college, though knowing that he was too young, I reluctantly let him go. He was admitted but proved unequal to the work. This letter, moreover, breathed not only a protest, but also a spirit of resentment. Query 1. Had it not been better for the boy, the father, the institution concerned, for that boy to have been forced to remain at home and take that tenth grade? Query 2. Is not this case too sadly typical of the human wreckage the most of us are responsible for?

In the next place, is there any significance in the fact that nineteen of these students came from four private high schools, while only twenty-five of them came from public high schools? When we remember the relative fewness of the former in comparison with the latter, it is clear that they prepare a larger proportion of their pupils for college by carrying them further. Of course, it is urged, the mission of the public high school is only secondarily to prepare for college. Nevertheless, it will be a sad day for the best educational interests of the South if we let a catch-word like the "People's College," meaning the high school, narrow our conception of its mission, or if we press too far in practical application that other phrase, "the high schools do not exist to prepare boys and girls for college." They do, if they are carrying out the real spirit of democracy. What is good enough for any man is not too good for all men. That is the democracy of education, and these so-called colleges of the people do most for the masses when they do most to bring the highest in education within their reach.

Next, the fact that all thirty conditioned students had from one to four of their conditions in foreign languages, ancient or modern, raises an educational question of more than passing importance. We seem to have reached the point where many boys take no language at all; Greek has gone and Latin is going, and the modern languages have not yet arrived; not a few spend three and four years over Latin and get nowhere in it. The

question is simply this: If linguistic training is really worth while, somebody, some influence, will have to get to work to see that it is kept going and kept going in the right way. There are still some of us who believe so strongly in it that we should not consider any high school course complete without at least four years of some language other than English.

Further, what is the meaning in the loss of forty per cent of the entering class? All other institutions reported proudly to our friends, the newspapers, that they had a record-breaking enrollment,—“the largest freshman class in the history of the institution,” with the familiar “et ceteras.” The institution under discussion had been topping them all in its academic freshmen by from twenty to thirty per cent. Of course, the boys are in college. Of that there can be no doubt. But alas! it must be the same old boys, with all their rawness, their immaturity, their generous lack of preparation, and we shall have at the end of the year a goodly list of names in the catalogue, and a long list of the slain and wounded in the college records. This latter list we do not publish; but there are parents who have it written in hearts sad with disappointed hopes. Still we can get some consolation in the thought of our duty to our constituents and in the conviction that the times are not ripe for a raise in the standard, that we must wait on the further practical working out of the high school movement. But, in the meanwhile, the high school inspector comes along to indict us of all sorts of educational high crimes and misdemeanors,—that we are hindering him in his great work; in plain figures, with names and dates, he tells us that we are actually breaking up high schools by taking the boys and girls from the eighth and ninth grades; he lays down what we know to be sound educational principles and bravely illustrates them with facts that accuse us to our very faces. Shall we continue to hinder or shall we begin to help? With the little experiment before us, are we willing to pay the cost with small classes and reduced rolls? But there will be rewards,—a satisfied educational conscience, a sense of high public service, less waste of boy life, fewer troubles of discipline to worry over, less distressing correspondence with parents, and even more numbers by and by, if we want them badly.

The German Element in the Settlement of the South.

BY WILLIAM H. WANNAMAKER.

Professor of German in Trinity College.

According to the eleventh census of the United States the frontier line of the country vanished in 1890; the great work of winning and settling the vast areas lying between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, was ended. A retrospect of this period, 1607 to 1890, in order to appreciate the part played in the work of settlement by the various foreign nations that through immigrants made it possible, is both interesting and highly edifying. The problem of correctly estimating each nation's share in it, and of determining just how much of this or that race's blood flows in the veins of the typical American today, is exceedingly difficult—in fact well nigh impossible. Still with time and effort it can be approximately solved; and every endeavor to throw light on any phase of it should be encouraged. Many false impressions of long standing regarding some of the most vital parts of early American history need to be corrected.

A large work attempting to set in its proper light the history of one of the largest elements, the German, in our country has recently appeared, and on it entirely the following sketch of the German's share in the history of the South is based*. It does not pretend to be exhaustive nor can it discuss evidence for and against doubtful minor details in dates of settlements. It is rather intended to call attention to the work mentioned, and to stimulate interest in this side of southern history.

The earliest German settlement in the South was that planned by Christopher Graffenried of Bern, Switzerland, at New Bern, North Carolina, in December, 1710. There is evidence to show that in the earliest English settlements Germans were present. But this settlement at New Bern was the first distinctly German settlement in the South. Chancing to arrive in London with some Swiss emigrants just when that city was overrun with

*The German Element in the United States, by A. B. Faust. Two vols. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.

thirteen thousand Palatines who were seeking refuge from intolerable conditions at home, Graffenried determined with the aid of Louis Michel (Michell, Mitschel), who was acquainted with conditions in America, to lead a settlement for the Carolinas. By paying twenty shillings sterling for each one hundred acres of land, and by obligating themselves to an annual quit-rent of six pence for every hundred acres, they obtained permission to make the settlement. One hundred thousand acres of land in addition was laid off and reserved for twelve years for their later purchase. Six hundred and fifty Palatine Germans set sail with them and their Swiss emigrants in two large vessels and arrived safely in the New World. They settled in one body at the confluence of the Neuse and Trent rivers, and called their settlement New Bern after the capital of Switzerland.

The first year the colonists experienced the horrors of a typical Indian massacre, during which about sixty Swiss and Palatines perished miserably around New Bern. Graffenried, who was away with the surveyor-general Lawson, was captured, and he escaped torture and death only by pretending that he was a king of the Germans. Lawson himself was tortured to death. Graffenried was kept in custody for a time by the Indians, but was finally released on the promise that the Palatines would not make war on them in revenge. This promise they kept, thereby arousing the enmity of the other white settlers.

Owing to the rascality of Graffenried and Michel, who withheld from the settlers the titles to their lands, actually selling them to their own creditors, the Germans petitioned the Carolina Council in 1714 for a grant of 400 acres of land for each family and two years' time to pay for it. The petition was granted and the settlers spread over what is now Craven county, where they were found occupying a wide area by a missionary in 1743.

The German settlers in the interior of North Carolina prior to the Revolutionary War did not come direct from Germany. They were Pennsylvania Germans. This "treking" began about 1745, but did not gain much headway until 1750. The settlers generally left Pennsylvania in the autumn just after harvest, and arrived in North Carolina before the commencement of winter. They thus had food sufficient to tide over the cold season without hardships. These Germans were of the general type of

Pennsylvania Germans, thrifty, industrious, religious, keen for their own advantage, and well informed in their branch of industry. Land records show that they bought lands as soon as possible. They seldom became traders, and therefore did not settle in towns.

An interesting connection was thus established between Pennsylvania and North Carolina. Even today the same German family names often occur in these two states. Bernheim, the historian of the Lutheran Church of the Carolinas, makes this interesting statement about these settlers and their descendents: "Had a traveller from Pennsylvania visited about forty or fifty years ago (1820-1830) portions of the present counties of Alamance, Guilford, Davidson, Rowan, Cabarrus, Stanly, Iredell, Catawba, Lincoln, and some others in the State of North Carolina, he might have believed himself to have unexpectedly come upon some part of the old Keystone State." As late as this date, 1820-1830, Pennsylvania German was still the language of the settlers.

The settlements of the Moravian foundation in Stokes and Forsyth counties were begun in 1754. In 1751 through their Bishop Spangenberg, the United Brethren of Pennsylvania purchased one hundred thousand acres of land in North Carolina from Lord Granville. After personal investigation the bishop deemed it advisable to settle east of the Yadkin River in Forsyth county. On August 7th, 1753, the deed was made out, signed, and sealed for 98,985 acres of land. It was called the Wachovia Tract, in honor of Count Zinzendorf, who was Lord of the Wachau Valley in Austria. In the autumn of 1753, twelve Moravians arrived from Pennsylvania by way of the Shenandoah Valley, and with seven other colonists coming the next year they founded Bethabara. The colony seems to have flourished, for by 1758 the Indians could report of the town, which they called "The Dutch Fort," that it contained "good people and much bread." Other towns were soon founded. In 1766 Salem was begun. This city has always been the center of the Moravian denomination in the South. In 1804 the Salem Female Academy was founded.

In South Carolina Charleston, in which Germans have long been prominent, received the first German settlers in that state.

By 1742 there were a good many Germans in Charleston. But though this city early became the distributing port for German immigrants for the South, it did not receive many of the earliest settlers. They moved inland and settled in Orangeburg county and the district known as Saxe-Gotha, which had been set apart during the reign of Queen Anne in 1714 as a refuge place for oppressed Germans. The name of this district was changed to Lexington in 1872. Prior to the Orangeburg settlements there was made at Purysburg in Beaufort county, in 1732, a settlement of Swiss Germans. Three hundred and seventy men came to Purysburg during the first year. This town was named for John Peter Pury, who received from the English government four hundred pounds sterling for every hundred able-bodied men he brought from Switzerland. The settlement became famous as being one of the earliest in America to attempt the culture of silk. For a time the colony flourished; but later, owing to the unhealthfulness of the place, it was practically abandoned.

Various settlements were made in the Orangeburg district from 1735 to 1737. These settlements were at once prosperous, as the Germans were largely tillers of the soil and had the good sense to settle on the most fertile lands. Furthermore, among the colonists there was fortunately a considerable number of mechanics, and with their services the colonists were practically independent.

The Saxe-Gotha district received German colonists as early as 1737. Significant is the frank statement made to the government by their pastor Theus, whom they, as was customary with the Germans, had brought with them from Germany, that, if schools and churches were not built, the Germans would go to Pennsylvania where such advantages were to be had. In order to keep them in South Carolina the government furnished the large sum of five hundred pounds, with which Pastor Theus built St. John's church.

From these settlements in Orangeburg and Saxe-Gotha, Germans spread into Barnwell, Newberry, Abbeville, and other counties. There were also independent German colonies at Hard Labor Creek in Abbeville, established in 1763-4, and at New Windsor, in Edgefield county, opposite the city of Augusta.

That all these settlements thrived and became permanent is evidenced by the fact that in 1788 a union of fifteen German churches was effected. Interesting is the fact that the Charleston church was not a member of this union. It is another illustration of the separateness existing between the seacoast and inland, or frontier, settlements.

There are evidences of Germans in Maryland as early as the latter part of the seventeenth century, but they did not arrive in considerable numbers until the early part of the eighteenth century, when many of them moved into Maryland from Pennsylvania. By the beginning of the Revolutionary War they were settled in large numbers around Baltimore, in whose early history they played an important part, and in Western Maryland; where they were mainly farmers. There they had halted while on their way to settle in Virginia at the invitation of the progressive Governor Spotswood. The Germans were quick to recognize the fine farming lands in Western Maryland, and when, in 1732, Lord Baltimore, eager to secure them as settlers, offered them these lands at a rental of one cent an acre and that not to be paid until the expiration of three years, they began pouring into the state. As early as 1729 Pennsylvania Germans had founded a settlement on the Monocacy river, and this became the center of the rapidly growing settlements founded in Frederick and Washington counties. In 1735 about one hundred families arrived direct from the Palatinate and founded Frederick Town. These settlers were fortunate in having as their leader and general director of their affairs the German, Thomas Schley. A contemporary of his, Pastor Schlatter, has this to say of him: "He spares neither labor nor pains in instructing the young, and edifying the congregation according to his ability, by means of singing and reading the word of God, and printed sermons on every Lord's Day." Of this Schley Admiral Schley of the United States Navy is a direct descendent.

Much still remains to be done before the full part played by Germans in the colonizing of Virginia can be appreciated. It is, however, undoubtedly true that the popular belief that this state was settled almost entirely by the English is false. The first German settlement made in Virginia was that at Germanna in 1714 by twelve families from the Palatinate. The Palatines had

long been skilled iron-workers, and as Governor Spottswood was anxious to establish successful iron-foundries in his state, he made an effort to induce some of them to undertake the work for him. In 1717 twenty additional families arrived, and in 1720 forty more. The Germans grew dissatisfied, however, as the governor refused to give them titles to their lands, and they gradually moved away from Germanna, which was finally entirely deserted. Of this colony the Reformed Lutherans founded Germantown in 1721, about ten miles from the Little Fork of the Rappahannock, on the Licking Run, near where there was already another group of Germans of the same faith; and the Lutherans moved into what is now Madison county, where they were called the "Upper Germans." All these settlements flourished, and by 1748 had excellent churches and school-houses. They were on the so-called piedmont plateau.

But by far the most important settlements of Germans in Virginia were made by immigrants from Pennsylvania. It is now established beyond a doubt that that part of the Shenandoah Valley sloping toward the north was settled almost entirely by Germans. This migration from Pennsylvania into Virginia started at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and continued until after the Revolutionary War. After the waves of settlers had filled the valley, they continued on through the gaps of South Mountain into the neighboring counties. Not until after the Revolutionary War did that part of the valley sloping toward the South receive many German settlers, but then immigrants came crowding in from Pennsylvania and Maryland. It is thus that the counties of Augusta, Rockbridge, Botetourt, Roanoke, Craig, Montgomery, Pulaski, and Wythe received an agricultural population.

The German settlers in Georgia were composed almost entirely of Salzburgers. These German Protestants, driven from the Austrian Archbishopric of Salzburg by a decree of Archbishop Leopold in 1731 which exiled all who were not Catholics, found homes in various Protestant countries. Just about this time an effort was being made to colonize the southern parts of the Carolinas, and for this colony, to be called Georgia, Scotch Highlanders and German Salzburgers were sought. With the help of the English Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge

and of the Georgia Land Company, the first group of Salzburgers, under the guidance of their ministers Bolzius and Gronau, arrived in Charleston, South Carolina, March, 1714, and proceeded to the settlement at Savannah established in 1733 by Oglethorpe. They chose land on the right bank of the river, about twenty miles above Savannah, where they founded Ebenezer. The Georgia Company was very liberal toward the Salzburgers, and others came over, notably in 1736, when the so-called "great embarkation" under von Reck arrived. At the request of the governor some of these newly arriving Germans founded Frederica on St. Simon's Island, intended to be a fortress against Spanish America. By 1743 this was, according to a traveler at that time, "a quiet village of the Salzburgers rurally charming, the improvements everywhere evincing the greatest skill and industry, considering its late settlement." It later declined and by 1751 was practically abandoned.

About two years after the founding of Ebenezer, the settlers became dissatisfied with the location, and moved about eight miles down the river, where they built New Ebenezer. This town was carefully laid out with spaces for school-house, church and parsonage, public storehouse, and orphan house. Under the wise leadership of Pastor Bolzius and his assistants and successors, the colony flourished. It is noted for having long successfully persisted in the manufacture of silk. By 1751 the Salzburgers were able to export to England silk to the value of one hundred and ten pounds sterling.

It is impossible to find out the exact number of Germans in these various settlements, or others made by them, before the Revolution; but a conservative estimate gives to Virginia and West Virginia (there were only three small settlements in West Virginia) 25,000, to Maryland and Delaware 20,500, to South Carolina 15,000, to North Carolina 8,000, and to Georgia 5,000. In order to appreciate the full meaning of the presence of so many Germans in these colonies several points should be carefully borne in mind. First, as to the character of the German immigrants.

While other ambitious countries were making efforts to establish colonies in the new world for political reasons, there was no strong central German government as of today, and before the

Revolution, therefore, no German settlement was made in America with the hope of gaining territory for Germany. The German settlers fled from their homes in order to escape intolerable conditions there, such as the effects of disastrous and devastating wars, religious persecution, or the tyranny of petty princes. The great majority of them were home-seekers, who came to America with the hope of finding a fair chance to establish prosperity for themselves and their descendants. They were not adventurers and therefore settled down and bought lands as quickly as possible. Furthermore, they were skilled in that branch of industry which they chose to continue in their new homes. That they became successful tillers of the soil is manifested in many ways. A glance at a map showing the location of German settlements in the American colonies before 1775 reveals the striking fact that both North and South they were located on the very best farming lands in the country. Just as in Pennsylvania the Germans possessed farms which became the granary that supplied the continental armies with bread during the Revolutionary War, so in the South the fertile Shenandoah Valley of Virginia,—which through German industry was to become a great farming section, and was destined to play so important a part in the Civil War,—the best farming lands in Western Maryland, and the most fertile lands under cultivation in the Carolinas were all in the possession of the Germans. It is not an exaggeration, therefore, to say that these permanent settlers furnished the realeconomic independence of the colonies. Convincing testimony along this line is contained in the following words of Governor Glenn of South Carolina, in the middle of the eighteenth century: "Our trade with New York and Philadelphia was of this sort, draining us of all the little money and bills that we could gather from other places for their bread, flour, beer, hams, bacon, and other things of their produce, all of which except beer our new townships began to supply us with, which were settled with very industrious and thriving Germans."

Again, no small proportion of these immigrants came for religion's sake and to seek religious freedom. Such was the case with the first permanent colony founded, that at Germantown, Pennsylvania, in 1683; and since so many of the later settlements were made by Germans from Pennsylvania, it is not incorrect to

assume that the same spirit largely characterized these colonists in North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland. All the Moravians, Mennonites, Salzburgers, and less important sects were deeply and sincerely pious and religious. Undoubtedly we have failed to do justice to this element in our early population. Who can estimate the heroism and the far reaching results of the work of those pioneer preachers and missionaries in their long journeys from scattered outpost to outpost along the dangerous frontier line of the colonies? And the religious zeal of these settlers certainly made them all the more desirable and successful pioneers.

John Wesley chanced to come to America on board the ship that brought the large band of Salzburgers to Georgia in 1736. He was profoundly impressed with the deep pity, reverence, and living faith of the Salzburgers; and he himself declared that he learned more from the Moravian pastor Boehler than from any other man he ever conversed with. Two years later he made the following entry in his journal: "It is now nearly two years and four monthssince I went to America to teach the Georgia Indians the nature of Christianity; but what have I learned of myself in the meanwhile? Why (what of all I least expected) that I who went to America to convert others, was never myself converted to God. Wesley says that he was converted in a meeting of the Moravians in London during the reading of Luther's preface to Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

But, as a rule, the German immigrant was poor, and consequently he had to push forward toward the frontier where land was cheap and plentiful. As a result, the whole border land of these colonies, with the exception of only the northwestern corners of North and South Carolina, was occupied by Germans. As a consequence they played a prominent part in Indian warfare,—far more important a part than is generally believed; and they were ready as soon as the great western areas began to open for settlement to flock into them. That they did this is clearly proved. Kentucky and Tennessee drew thousands of Germans from the Carolinas, and many of the most prominent early names in the history of those states are found earlier in Virginia or the Carolinas. As early as 1812 the North Carolina synod of the Lutheran Church had under its control nine congregations in Tennessee, and it maintained supervision of them until 1820. By

that time Lutherans had become so numerous in Tennessee that an independent synod was formed. It is interesting to note that until 1827 German was the official language of this synod, though as early as 1825 the minutes were printed in both languages.

What has been said regarding the character and location of these German settlers will go far to explain their attitude toward the cause of the colonies in their struggle with England. In the great majority of instances they were staunchly loyal to the American cause. While, as a rule, they tenaciously held on to their customs and language, the very fact that they quickly became the owners of homes and lands made them feel intimately identified with the interests and welfare of their new country. No political connection was maintained with the fatherland. The fact that Washington's bodyguard was largely made up of Germans, after a plot had been discovered in the first guard to seize the person of the commander, goes to show that there was much confidence in the loyalty of the Germans. In the valley of Virginia, before the beginning of any hostilities, the Germans adopted, June 16, 1774, bold resolutions, giving expression to their discontent with the acts of Parliament and binding themselves not to submit to oppression, but to join with their "brethren in Boston and every part of North America.....to procure redress of our grievances, and to secure our common liberties." Of the committee to look after the safety of the county, Dunmore, Peter Muehlenberg was chairman, and associated on the committee of six with him there were at least two other Germans.

When we remember that in North and South Carolina the Tories were at least two-fifths of the population, that in Georgia they were probably still more numerous, that in Virginia one-sixth of the population in the beginning of the war was loyal to England, while in the northern states Loyalists were very numerous, we can begin to appreciate the significance of the presence of the German settlers, the great majority of whom were undoubtedly in favor of the war.

Of the many Germans conspicuous in the Revolution many were living in the South. Peter Muehlenberg,—a son of the famous pastor of Pennsylvania, and a grandson of John Conrad Weiser, another German hero in colonial history,—fired the Vir-

ginia Germans to patriotic fervor and readily mustered a full regiment of Germans. He was later made a brigadier-general in command of the First, Fifth, Ninth, and Thirteenth Virginia regiments. With his Virginians he was later on duty with Steuben in front of Yorktown when Cornwallis made to this German general, who was in command when the British flag was lowered, his first overtures of peace. George Weedon (Gerhardt von der Wieden) who had settled in Fredericksburg, Virginia, after the French and Indian War was over, in which he had served as lieutenant of the Royal (German) Americans, was another German to become prominent as an officer in the Revolution.

In Georgia, where there was a fierce contention between the Tories and Patriots, the Salzburger Treutlen took an active part among the Germans and other Georgians in the cause of freedom. In May, 1777, he was elected the first governor of the state under the new constitution. During the next year he was made dictator by the Georgia Council. He was later forced to leave his home, which was burned by the English; and, though fifty-three years old, he joined the Continental Army and served in it throughout the war. Other Salzburgers were also conspicuous in the cause of the colonists.

The German Fusileers of Charleston, South Carolina, organized in 1775, did faithful service, as did the Maryland Germans under Gist, and the so-called "Dutch Mess" among Morgan's Sharpshooters. The Germans under Morgan came largely from Virginia and the Carolinas.

Enough has been said to suggest the significance of so many Germans in the southern colonies up to the Revolution, and to call attention to the fact that they took an active and honorable part in that war. After the colonial period, while settlements of Germans already made in the South continued to grow, it was the new lands of Kentucky and Tennessee that attracted most attention for pioneer settlers. As has been said, there were streams of German immigrants from the Carolinas and Virginia into this "No Man's Land." Later, through the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the Mississippi Valley was open for settlement, and gradually the great West became the center of activity. After the battle of New Orleans in 1815 immigrants advanced rapidly toward Louisiana, and it was not until after this date that many

Germans settled in this part of the South. That New Orleans was made the port of distribution for Germans in numbers is shown by the fact that between June, 1847, and May, 1887, 284,900 Germans landed there. They were then transported up the Mississippi, and settled in various parts of the Southwest and West. New Orleans contained about 10,000 Germans in 1840.

Especially interesting is the history of the German settlements in Texas owing to the fact that a distinct effort was made to make of it a German state. Germans were prominent in this state when it was still a part of Mexico, and they helped to gain its independence. Before its annexation to the Union, a German society of New York, and later, in 1842, the Mainzer Adelsverein of Germany, a company of noblemen, strove to direct German immigrants in such streams into Texas that the state would naturally become German. Their efforts were secretly connived at by the British Government, which did not wish the state to be absorbed by the United States. But while they did send many Germans into the State, the unbusinesslike management of their scheme caused its utter failure. Texas, however, was thus well advertised in Germany and received a large German population. It contains today more Germans than any other southern state.

But while the West and Southwest received the great majority of German immigrants during these years of their rapid settlement, the original southern colonies have been steadily attracting Germans. With the exception of Florida and Louisiana, every southern state in 1900 contained more native Germans than foreigners of any other European race. In the South, as elsewhere in the nation, the Germans are widely and evenly distributed. Of all southern cities only Baltimore and New Orleans contain as many as 5,000 native Germans.

The Necessity for Road Improvement in the South.

BY LOGAN WALLER PAGE,

Director of Office of Public Roads, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Ever since the dawn of civilization the question of transportation has forced itself upon the attention of the human race. Suitable and adequate facilities for mutual intercourse are today more than ever before essential to our very existence and general well-being. In peace or war, in prosperity or adversity, this problem remains with us. It is hard to conceive, therefore, that we of progressive America should for so long have remained contented to maintain our public roads, one of our most important avenues of transportation, in a condition little less than disgraceful.

The only avenues of transportation we have are our railroads, our waterways, and our common highways. These are to a great extent interdependent, and are of almost equal importance to the social and commercial interests of our country. Consequently, one of these avenues is as deserving of our best efforts for its improvement as another. Our railroads have been so well developed that they are conceded to be the best in the world, and, as a result of the present agitation for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and inland waterways, we may confidently expect to see them attain an equal degree of excellence. Our public roads, however, are among the most sadly neglected to be found on the habitable globe, and a concerted and concentrated effort should be put forth to effect their improvement.

This is especially true in regard to the South. According to information gathered by the Office of Public Roads, there were 2,155,000 miles of public roads in the United States in 1904, of which 790,284 miles were in the South. Of this 790,284 miles, only 31,780, or just a fraction over four per cent, were improved, while for the whole United States 7.14 per cent of the total mileage was improved. The expenditures for roads in the South for the same year, 1904, were \$12,636,838.63 in cash and \$11,232,013.80 in labor. No later statistics are available on

these points, but it is certain that both the expenditures and mileage of improved roads have been increased considerably since 1904, as is shown by returns from about two-thirds of the counties in the southern states.

The South is today enjoying an era of prosperity and expansion. Improvements are noticeable along all lines. Its population is increasing each year; its manufacturing industries are being enlarged; its railroads are being extended, and its agriculture is each year opening up to new possibilities, and bringing new areas under its domain. But in order for this growth to continue, it will be necessary that the roads of the South be improved; for bad roads will checkmate its increase in population, hamper the enlargement of its manufactures, impede its railroad development, and restrict its agriculture.

A good healthy increase in population is needed by the South, but this increase will not come in the midst of bad roads. From information assembled on this point, it was shown that in twenty-five counties, selected from eastern, southern, western and northwestern states, in which only one and one-half per cent of the roads were improved, there was an actual decrease in population of 77,823 for the ten year period from 1890 to 1900, or a decrease of 3,112 for each county. During the same period, twenty-five other counties in the same states, in which forty per cent of the roads were improved, showed an increase in population of 778,383, or an average of 31,095 for each county. It follows, therefore, that bad roads often mean a decrease, while good roads mean an increase in population.

The development of manufactures and railroads depends on the supply of raw materials to be manufactured and of commodities to be hauled, into both of which the products of agriculture enter very largely. Therefore, agriculture bears an intimate relation to the industrial development of the country, and in the South it is practically the basis of it. So, to foster southern agriculture is to foster southern prosperity generally, and no greater stimulus could be given than to improve the roads throughout the South.

Under the soil and climatic conditions of the South, almost every species of known crop thrives. In addition to the staple crops, fruits and vegetables can be grown every month in the

year, and, with proper transportation facilities the northern markets can be supplied with these during the winter months at highly remunerative prices. At present, corn, cotton and tobacco are the chief crops of the South, but statistics show that these are not the most profitable crops to grow, for the average value per acre of wheat in the United States is \$7.03, of oats \$7.34, of corn \$8.72, of cotton \$15.27, of vegetables \$42.00, and of small fruits \$80.80. In order, therefore, to produce the most profitable crops, more attention must be given to trucking and fruit growing. Bad roads, however, place an embargo on this class of farming except in the immediate vicinity of market or railroad station, because these products must be put upon the market while fresh and succulent and in an unbruised condition. This can not be done over bad roads, so it is essential that the South improve its roads before its soil can be utilized in the production of the most profitable crops.

There are millions of acres of land already under cultivation in the South which could better be used for trucking than for any other purpose, and there are millions more of acres on the coast now uncultivated and unproductive for want of drainage. Projects are on foot for draining these lands, and when drained they will be the most fertile and best adapted lands for trucking in the world. But regardless of this fact, if they are situated ten miles from a shipping point on an impassable road, they cannot be so farmed with profit, while if they are at a distance of twenty miles on a good road, they can be so farmed. Farmers on Long Island haul fruit and truck into New York City, twenty-five and even thirty miles over good roads, at a profit.

Conditions in the South require road improvement more urgently than in the North, for the reason that in the South the roads are subjected to more continuous traffic during the winter months, and, as they are most always wet at this season, they are cut up very badly and become almost impassable. In the North, conditions are different. There the roads are covered with ice and frozen over during the winter months, which affords a good smooth surface over which all traffic can pass. The snow protects the road from being cut up. In order to have good hard roads in the South during this period, it is necessary to improve them by proper grading, drainage, and surfacing.

To offset the advantage of the North over the South in this respect, the roads of the South can be improved much more cheaply than those of the North. In the South, labor is cheaper, and convict labor can be used to a greater extent and more successfully than in the North. Also a cheaper type of road can be adopted in the South than in the North, as in the South sand-clay roads can be constructed which will answer all ordinary traffic requirements and cost only about one-tenth as much as macadam, or other roads suitable to northern conditions, will cost. Then too, roads in the South are not subject to as severe frosts and freezes as in the North, and consequently the injury from this prolific source of damage to roads is only slight, which necessarily makes the cost of maintenance less in the South. So, while the South stands in greatest need of road improvement, its conditions are most favorable for meeting that need.

But reforms in present methods of administration are necessary before the South can hope to avail itself fully of its opportunities for improving its roads. The tendency in most of the southern states has been to restrict participation in road work to the counties, or even to subdivisions of the counties. State participation has thus far been confined to the states of Maryland, Missouri, Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia, and North Carolina, the latter two states extending aid in the form of convict labor. Every southern state should establish a highway department and appropriate money or convict labor for state aid in building roads. Such a department, under the direction of a competent and experienced highway engineer, would mean the introduction of correct methods of construction and maintenance and would result in an annual saving far in excess of the cost of maintaining the department. It would also insure uniformity of methods and a continuity of purpose which would ultimately give the South a system of connected highways in which every road would form a link.

The South has had enough of bad roads and should free itself from their bondage. They impose a heavy and unnecessary burden upon its entire citizenship. They compel the consumer in the city to pay excessively for the necessities of life, and at the same time diminish the profits of the farmer by forcing him to make fewer trips, haul smaller loads, consume more time, and

market his produce when roads are passable and not when prices are best. In short, they are the arch enemy of prosperity and progress.

On the other hand, improved roads in the South will lighten the burdens of its citizens and stimulate agricultural and industrial expansion. They will guarantee the consumer a regular supply of the necessities of life, for which he is dependent on the farmer, and at reasonable prices, while they will at the same time increase the profits of the farmer by enabling him to make quicker trips, haul larger loads, and market his produce when prices are best. They build up the social and moral tone of the community, improve school conditions, increase property values, and encourage a spirit of progressiveness along all lines. In fact, the improvement of the roads of the South will prove a most potent influence in the realization of its great possibilities.

The Antecedents of the North Carolina Convention of 1835.

[CONTINUED.]

BY WILLIAM K. BOYD,

Professor of History in Trinity College.

III. REPRESENTATION AND SECTIONALISM.

In the preceding pages two features of the Constitution of 1776 have been outlined, namely, the inefficient form of government and the perpetuation of certain political and social ideas against which the spirit of later years protested. While these phases of the constitution were sufficient to demand reform, a greater grievance was the system of representation, by which membership in the General Assembly was apportioned equally among the counties, irrespective of population. This proved to be a bulwark of sectional interests within the state, which in time became so intense that united effort for progress and general welfare was well-nigh impossible. Consequently representation and sectionalism formed the central issue of the agitation for reform. Some review of the origin and interaction of these contributing factors is necessary; indeed it gives an insight into the method of settlement, the political ideas, and the social origins of colonial Carolina.

The earliest permanent settlements in North Carolina were made in that strip of territory south of Virginia, between Albemarle sound and the Roanoke river. There the Lords Proprietors established the county of Albemarle. It was given a representative Assembly which, after 1670, was composed of five members from each precinct. Now the opening wedge for sectionalism was the restriction of representation from other counties to two members from each precinct. Consequently the precincts of Bath county, organized in 1696 to include the territory south of Albemarle, did not have the same political influence as those of the older county. The method of forming new counties and precincts, as well as the right to regulate elections, was not stated in the proprietary instructions; consequently the Governor

and Council assumed the duty of organizing counties, and the Assembly that of fixing suffrage and elections.* This division of administrative authority continued until the transfer of the colony to the Crown. Coincident with it began that larger controversy between the executive and the legislature which culminated in the Revolution. One of its first phases was the attempt of the Assembly to control the organization of counties and precincts. In 1729 before the royal authorities took possession, Governor Everard and Council issued orders for the new county of New Hanover, but the Assembly refused to admit its representatives until the formation of the county was approved by statute. In 1731-32 Burrington and Council established three new counties, Onslow, Bladen, and Edgecombe. At once there was protest by the Assembly, and a petition was sent to the Lords of Trade declaring that this method of creating new counties would make the lower house dependent on the upper, thus "violating the birth-right of British subjects to be governed by no laws but what are of their own making."† For years the method of creating counties was the subject of controversy; it was finally settled in 1754 in the interest of the Governor and Council.

Much of this contention is explained by the problem of political sectionalism. The Albemarle precincts, where the custom of resistance to outside authority had long been manifest, had a larger representation than the precincts of Bath prior to 1729, and in that year a new lease on their privilege was secured in the organization of the new precinct of Tyrell. If the Governor and Council maintained the right of forming new counties, there was danger that through executive patronage a party antagonistic to the Albemarle leaders might be built up; indeed an opening for such action was present in the diversity of economic interests between the Albemarle and Cape Fear regions.

This phase of the issue is well illustrated by the unarmed rebellion of 1746, during the administration of Governor Gabriel Johnston. Soon after his arrival in 1734 the policy of the Albemarle leaders attracted his attention. On consultation with

*See Biennial Act of 1715, C. R. II, 218. Albemarle was divided into precincts by proprietary orders. The Bath precincts were established by the Palatine's Court or the Governor's Council.

†C. R. III, 439-457.

the Council he decided on two measures of reform: one, to make the permanent meeting-place of the Assembly a town in the newer precincts (called counties after 1739); the other, to equalize representation among the counties. The way for reform was opened by the disallowance, in 1737, of the Biennial Act of 1715, which had outlined the system of elections and representation in vogue during the proprietary period. So Governor Johnston called the session of 1746 to meet in June at Newbern. Two new counties were created, Granville and Johnston, and a bill was introduced to make Newbern the permanent meeting place for the Assembly, but it was rejected. The Governor thereupon prorogued the Assembly to meet at Wilmington in November. The Albemarle members, in order to thwart the Governor, adopted the plan of non-attendance thus hoping to prevent a quorum. They were successful; only fifteen of the fifty-four members appeared. But acting on the example of the English Parliament, in which 40 members out of 556 constituted a quorum, these fifteen proceeded to business and enacted laws which fixed the seat of government at Newbern and equalized representation by giving each county the right to send two members to the Assembly.

Elections were held for the next session which convened at Newbern in February, 1747. The Albemarle counties returned their accustomed number of members on the ground that the revision of representation was made by less than a quorum and was therefore null and void. But the organization and leadership of the body were in the hands of the members from the newer counties, and the Albemarle representatives were not admitted. Governor Johnston, afraid to order new elections, continued the Assembly under successive prorogations. In retaliation the people of the Albemarle section refused to pay taxes, attend the courts, or to support the government. On the other hand the people of the newer counties, claiming that the burdens of government should not rest on them exclusively, were likewise indifferent. Thus arose a deadlock which lasted until 1754, when the British authorities disallowed the law revising representation and restored the privileges of the Albemarle section, which lasted until the opening of the Revolution.*

In the meantime, as immigration into the colony increased, a

*Ashe, *History of N. C.* I, 268-270; C. R., IV *passim*.

new section appeared; viz, the middle and western counties. The frontier, which in 1734 extended from the present eastern boundary of Caswell on the north across the colony to the western part of Brunswick, had advanced by 1765 to the foot of the Blue Ridge. Twenty new counties were formed from 1734 to 1775. Their inhabitants were mainly Scotch-Irish, Germans, Welsh, and Scotch, while in the older sections the English element predominated. The old sectional issue between the Albemarle counties and those to the south now gave way to a new one, a rivalry between the new middle and western counties, and the older ones of the east. The eastern counties, thrown together by similarity of race and traditions, exploited the system of local government. The officials of the new counties were appointed by the executive; usually they were eastern men, frequently belonging to the more adventurous and fortune-seeking class. On the other hand the people of the west, outnumbered in the assembly and unskilled in the political methods of the province, became restive.

These conditions furnish the background of the Regulator movement, primarily a protest against abuses in local government. The first hope of redress, so far as representation was concerned, came with the Revolution. That movement was initiated by the leaders of the Assembly, most of whom were eastern men. Consequently the western counties were at first lukewarm. To remove this prejudice, the third provincial Congress was called to meet at Hillsboro in August, 1775. This body marks a crisis in the affairs of the province. Armed resistance to the British had begun, and Governor Martin had taken refuge on a man-of-war. Before the Congress was the task of taking over the administration of the province and forming at least a provisional government. This involved the assumption of sovereign powers. United effort was necessary. To secure it, inequality was laid aside; in the call to the congress each county was authorized to send five or more delegates, and in the deliberations the voting was by counties, not individuals. Thus in the hour of constitutional crisis, inequality among the counties passed away. The next year equal representation was made permanent by the State Constitution.*

Thus the ancient privileges of the Albemarle section passed

*C. R. IX, 1285; X, 165 and *passim*; Constitution of 1776.

away. But sectionalism still remained. An irregular line, including the present eastern boundary of Granville, thence along the western boundaries of Wake, Harnett, Cumberland, and Scotland counties divided the state into two factions. The counties on the east were more numerous. As representation was apportioned equally among the counties, they had a majority in the General Assembly.* But this supremacy was unjust in the light of economic conditions. The average size of the western counties was greater than that of those in the east; their resources were fresh, their development more rapid. Population, outlined in the following table, well illustrates the inequality.

	WEST	INCREASE	PER CT.	EAST	INCREASE	PER CT.
1790	159,752			234,297		
1800	219,904	60,152	37 5-10	258,179	23,882	10 2-10
1810	263,219	43,315	19 7-10	292,280	34,101	13 2-10
1820	308,139	44,920	17 1-10	330,690	38,410	13 1-10
1830	374,092	65,953	21 4-10	363,896	33,206	10

These figures show that at each decade there was a larger increase in population in the west than the east until in 1830 the west surpassed the east; also between 1820 and 1830 there was a decline of population in three eastern counties. In defence against argument for reform, the east pointed to its larger wealth, for its taxes were greater than those paid by the west. Unfortunately there is no way to ascertain the exact relative wealth of the two sections, for the revenue system was notoriously inefficient. The sources of taxation were the land and the polls. But the lands assessed for federal tax in 1815 showed a decline in valuation when assessed for state tax in 1833; indeed the only factor that showed a general increase in land values for the state in 1833 was the new lands opened up, mostly in the west. A similar situation is revealed in the assessment for poll tax; in 1833 the number of white polls assessed was 14,492 less than the number of taxable polls reported by the census of 1830, and the number of black polls 28,610 less. Consequently until more reliable estimates shall be made, the relative wealth of the east and the west will never be known.†

*This division of eastern and western counties is based on the official vote calling the Convention of 1835. Person county, which voted with the East, was by location a western county.

†See documents reprinted in Coon, *Documentary History of Education in N. C. prior to 1840*, Vol. II, pp. 622, 625. (Publications of the N. C. Historical Commission).

However, if the system of representation be viewed from the interests of the state at large, it was clearly unjust. According to the assessment of 1815 seven counties, eastern and western, (Gates, Columbus, Lenoir, Ashe, Haywood, Perquimans, Pasquotank, and Tyrrel), had a total land value less than Rowan, a large western county, or Halifax, a large eastern county; yet these seven counties chose twenty-one representatives of the Assembly, Rowan three (one a borough member), and Halifax two.

By the assessment of 1833, 33 of the 64 counties contributed less than one-third of the state's revenue; 40 did not pay taxes enough to cover their cost to the state; yet they had a majority in the Assembly. Indeed there were 24 counties whose aggregate expenses more than doubled their public taxes. There were 20 that did not pay into the treasury enough for their share in law-making; 12 paid an aggregate state tax of \$5,400 while the expenses of their representatives averaged \$8,000 per annum. Population from this state-wide view showed similar results. In 1820 12 small counties sent 36 members to the Assembly; Rowan and Orange, two western counties, sent six, but the population of the two groups was approximately equal. In 1833, 33 counties, with little more than one-third of the total population, sent 99 members, but on the basis of white population they had larger representation than 31 counties with more than two-thirds of the white population.*

One remedy for this inequality was to increase the number of western representatives by dividing the large counties. But the east was opposed to any reduction of its political power, and the organization of new western counties was usually followed by an increase in the east. From 1776 to 1833 eighteen counties were organized in the west, while fifteen were formed in the east. This small gain of three counties was by no means strong enough to overthrow the sectional majority. As time passed the organization of new western counties became more and more difficult, because the territory available for corresponding counties in the east was gradually exhausted. Considerable astuteness on the part of the western leaders was therefore necessary. A favorite method to secure eastern votes was to name the new

*Debate on the Convention Question in the House of Commons, 1821, Address to the Freemen of N. C. (1833), and Proceedings of a Meeting of Members of the Legislature (1834). These are pamphlets but the material in the last two may also be found in the Raleigh papers of the period.

counties for eastern leaders; thus Burke, Caswell, Iredell, Ashe, Moore, and Macon were named for active eastern men, and Buncombe, Stanly, and Davie for deceased leaders of the east. How acute was the sectional hostility to new counties is illustrated by events in 1822-23. A bill was introduced and passed to create the new county of Davidson during the session of 1822; the next year every eastern man who voted for it failed to be re-elected. Among these was Ex-Governor Miller, of Warren, who was defeated by General M. T. Hawkins, on the ground that a new western county endangered the interests of the east and placed the constitution of the state in jeopardy.*

IV. THE AGITATION FOR REFORM.

As the creation of new western counties was checked, the only hope for more equitable representation of the west lay in the revision of the constitution by a convention. To trace the agitation for reform from its inception to 1835 is a tedious task, for the cause is almost as old as statehood itself; moreover, many bills, reports, and pamphlets relating to it have been lost. But the perspective of years places certain manifestations of discontent in bold relief before all others.

First of these was that in 1787. Eleven years had passed since equal representation had been embodied in the state constitution. The great question of ratifying the federal constitution was now before the people. On the Assembly devolved the duty of summoning a convention to consider federal relations. In the Senate a group of members hoped to refer to the convention the question of local constitutional reform. Indeed they were able to carry a resolution for a joint committee to investigate the changes that were needed and to report to the convention, but the measure was lost in the Commons. The reforms specified were a change in the system of representation and less frequent sessions of the Assembly. Later authorities state that members of the Assembly, who had been members of the Convention of 1776 which framed the constitution, with one exception favored the resolutions looking to reform and that their rejection was due to the representatives from the seven trans-montane counties that soon became a part of Tennessee. Was this a log-roll by

*Barriuger, *History of N. C. R. R.*

which the far western counties were promised the aid of the east in the movement for separation in return for votes against reform? In spite of failure in the Assembly, the reform proposition was brought up in the convention of 1788; again it was defeated, according to tradition, by the votes of the trans-montane counties.*

No sooner was the issue of ratification of the federal constitution settled in 1789 than the question of reform again appeared. In 1790 a committee of investigation was appointed in the Commons, but there was so much lack of agreement among its members that no plan of action was recommended. At almost every session for a number of years there were resolutions and debates on reform. The sectional issue even influenced the location of the capital. The Convention of 1788 authorized the General Assembly to select a permanent seat of government within ten miles of the Hunter plantation in Wake county. But the instruction was not carried out because the Cape Fear and western members favored Fayetteville. In 1790 a bill to carry out the instruction was carried in the Commons by the deciding vote of the speaker, Stephen Cabarrus, an eastern man, but was rejected in the Senate by the casting vote of its speaker, Wm. L. Lenoir, a western leader. The next session of the Assembly was then ordered to meet at Newbern; there the eastern influences were strong enough to pass a bill locating the capital in Wake. Tradition says that the success of the east was due to the votes of the trans-montane counties; was this also a log-roll?†

The controversy over the capital lends interest to an effort for reform in 1808 when Jesse A. Pearson of Rowan introduced the following resolution in the Senate;—

"Whereas representation should bear an equal ratio with taxation and population, whereas frequent sessions are unnecessary and expensive, whereas public interest and commerce would be promoted by removal of the Seat of Government from Raleigh to Fayetteville, resolved that a law be made for calling a convention," etc.

This resolution in so far as it coupled removal of the capital with constitutional reform was no more than a threat, for it

*Senex Letters, Raleigh Register, May 28, 1833; message of Governor Swain, Nov. 17, 1834.

†Battle, History of the Capitol (pamphlet).

was not introduced until the last day of the session. It was laid on the table, but it forecasts the effort to unite the issues of a new capital and that of reform, which marked the agitation of 1832.

The next aggressive action was in 1811. John Reid, Senator from Lincoln County, introduced comprehensive resolutions which provided for biennial sessions and elections, and the apportionment of representation in the Senate according to districts and in the House of Commons according to counties. The Senate sent a message to the House advising that the resolutions be printed, which was agreed to. Yet in spite of this auspicious opening and Mr. Reid's able argument, the Senate, on December 6, rejected the resolutions by a large majority.

Five years later, in 1816, the cause of reform received its first able literary expression. The militia officers of Rutherford County petitioned the Senate on the constitutional question. Their memorial was referred to a committee of which Archibald DeBow Murphy was chairman. Its report, written in the unmistakable style of Murphy, was a dignified statement of principles as well as needs too lengthy to quote.

Another effort toward reform was made in the Senate of 1819 by Duncan Cameron. For three days his resolutions, which included the popular election of the governor and sheriffs, biennial sessions, revision of representation and the submission of the convention question to the people, were debated; by a vote of 36 nays to 32 yeas they were defeated. Similar resolutions introduced into the Commons by Mr. Mangum were also rejected. The following year John A. Cameron of Fayetteville submitted a resolution in the Commons for a convention, which was postponed indefinitely. Then in 1821 Charles Fisher of Salisbury introduced resolutions in the Commons that representation should be apportioned according to free white population and taxes; these were rejected by the large vote of 81 to 47.*

The agitation from 1819 to 1821 was very intense. A later authority says the whole state was convulsed from mountains to sea. Finding their efforts for reform of no avail, the leaders of the movement decided to appeal directly to the people. A caucus of western senators and representatives was held during

*Senate Journal, Nov. 23, 1819; *Ral. Reg.* Nov. 26, 1819; *Minerva*, Dec. 10 House Journal, Dec. 14, 18, 1821, *Ral. Reg.*, *Passim*.

the last days of the session of 1822. A popular convention, to meet at Raleigh in the following November, was deemed the best way of crystalizing public sentiment in the west. An election of delegates was recommended, and to conduct the convention campaign a general Committee of Correspondence was appointed, and the members of the Assembly were authorized to appoint local committees in their respective counties. An address to the people was drawn up, of which 10,000 copies were ordered to be printed.

Twenty-four out of twenty-six counties appealed to responded by sending forty-seven delegates to Raleigh on Nov. 10, 1823, just ten days before the meeting of the General Assembly. General Montford Stokes was elected President. The work of the Convention was done by three committees; one which examined the condition of population and taxes, one which drafted amendments to the Constitution, and one which formed a plan submitting the proposed reforms to the people. The reports of these committees reveal a cleavage among the leaders of the reform movement. In the committee on amendments the delegates from the extreme west, where there were few slaves, favored free white population as the basis of representation, while those from the central west, where slaves were more numerous, desired that federal numbers, whites and three-fifths of the blacks, be made the basis. The plan of the central counties prevailed, the committee recommending that 4,000 federal population be made the unit of representation in the Commons and 10,000 in the Senate. Adopting federal numbers not only alienated the extreme west; it also robbed the convention of all claim to be a popular movement; for the committee on population and taxes showed that on the basis of federal numbers the body represented 272,431 people, 11,833 less than the unrepresented population; while on the basis of white population 233,333 were represented, a majority of 33,954. The same committee also found that the taxes of the represented counties were nearly \$10,000 less than those of the unrepresented counties. Clearly unless white population were adopted as the basis of representation, the convention itself was not a representative body. Moreover, its proposed adoption of federal numbers would be of little benefit to the extreme west; it would merely unite the central slave-holding counties and the

east, and thus block all future efforts at reform. Yet the proposed amendments were adopted by the convention. According to the report of the committee on submitting reforms to the people, the issues were to be voted on at the next general election when delegates should also be chosen for a second convention, on the basis of the federal numbers.*

After a week's session the convention adjourned. Its cause was undoubtedly a just one, but the cleavage between the extreme western and the central counties was fatal; also the resort to a second convention smacked too much of revolution. Consequently there were no effective results. The General Assembly, which met two days after the convention adjourned, did nothing. The campaign for ratification and a second convention was a failure. Not enough delegates were elected to organize a convention—even the approval of Thomas Jefferson, published in the papers of the time, had no effect.†

During the next six years the convention agitation subsided. For this there were several reasons. One was undoubtedly the failure of the movement in 1822-23. Another was the excitement in national politics. The presidential election of 1824, one of the landmarks in the division of the old Republican party, was as exciting in North Carolina as elsewhere. Political ideas, economic conditions, and the sectional spirit determined the result. In the east, where slavery was well established, political theories were conservative and Crawford received a majority of the votes, for he was regarded as the representative of the older state rights views of Madison and Jefferson. On the other hand the western counties, where slavery was not so extensive, and political traditions not so conservative, at first supported Calhoun, and, when Calhoun and Jackson united forces in March, 1824, they supported the coalition known as the People's Ticket. In the central part of the state, however, there were three counties, Guilford, Chatham, and Randolph, known as the Quaker District, which turned to John Quincy Adams, principally on account of his anti-slavery ideas. The result of the election was that the People's Ticket ran ahead of sectional lines, carrying 42 of 63 counties in the state. Of the twenty-one counties giving

*For proceedings and reports of the convention, see Raleigh Register of the period; also Wagstaff, *State Rights and Political Parties in N. C.*

†Western Carolinian, April 19, 1824.

a majority for Crawford, three were those of the Quaker District, which deserted Adams for Crawford in the hope of preventing a majority in the electoral college and thus throwing the election into the House of Representatives. That result was attained; in the House Adams was elected; and the one member of Congress from the Quaker District cast the only effective vote of North Carolina. But this sectional division in national affairs did not prove permanent, for in 1828 the east as well as the west cast its vote for Jackson, believing him at heart to be a state rights man.*

While the sections within the state were dividing and reuniting around the banner of Jackson, the tariff policy of Congress furnished another absorbing issue. While the prevailing political theories in the state were conservative, there was some radical sentiment which was very strong in the Senate of 1830. The task of the majority was to criticise, even protest against, the tariff, but not to be led away from the older political ideas of state and federal relations into the new theories embodied in nullification. This course was successfully carried out. A protest against the tariff was registered by the Assembly of 1827-28; two years later popular meetings throughout the state formally condemned South Carolina's threat of nullification and in 1832 formal repudiation of nullification was adopted by the Assembly, along with a declaration that the tariff was unconstitutional.†

In the meantime forces were at work which revived the interest in constitutional reform. Western influence was strong enough in the Assembly of 1830 to secure the election of Montford Stokes, prominent in the agitation of 1822-23, as governor over Richard Dobbs Spaight, an eastern leader. Two years later David L. Swain, of Buncombe, was made governor and held office until 1836. Also a new set of leaders was rising to prominence. In the Assembly of 1831 there were 101 new members, 27 in the Senate and 74 in the Commons. The burning of the capitol in the summer of 1831 also opened the way for obstruction to its rebuilding at Raleigh unless the convention question were referred to the people. The economic situation also caused protest. The census showed that the rank of North Carolina in

*Wagstaff, *State Rights and Political Parties in N. C.* ch. 2.

†*Ibid.*, ch. 2.

population had declined from third among the states in 1790 to fourth in 1800, 1810 and 1820, and to fifth in 1830; also the western counties had by 1830 outstripped the east in population. A profound sense of depression, of laggardness in economic development, was widespread. The remedy seemed to be a more liberal policy of internal improvements on the part of the state, one that should bind together all sections by transportation facilities and so develop the latent economic resources. Yet in spite of popular demands for internal improvements and the recommendations of the Board of Internal Improvements nothing was done. The chief cause of inactivity was the intense sectional partisanship which prevented any united action in behalf of the state at large. Clearly some reform in representation, which would allay sectional strife, was necessary before North Carolina could take any forward step in industrial development.

These general influences lend intelligibility and interest to the last years of the agitation for reform. In 1830 resolutions for a convention in the Commons were as usually postponed. The Board of Internal Improvements also advised larger appropriations for its work but received no assistance. The next session the west attacked the reform problem in a new way. The capitol building at Raleigh burned in the summer of 1831. A movement was immediately started to block any appropriation for rebuilding unless concession on the convention question was made, and, in order to win the support of the Cape Fear counties, the west agreed to the removal of the capital from Raleigh to Fayetteville. The alignment of factions on this issue is well told in a letter of the time.

"There are five parties here. The largest (but it does not constitute a majority) is for rebuilding the capitol and is opposed to a convention in every form. This may be named the Eastern party. The next in point of magnitude is the Western party; they want a reconstruction of our constitution with respect to political power, and want no more, but will either keep the government at Raleigh or remove it to Fayetteville, as one or the other will favor their great end. The third in point of size is the Fayetteville party; their main object is removal, but they are willing also to go for a general convention. The two others are of about the same magnitude, the Northwestern and South-

western parties. The former want a modification of the constitution, but are utterly opposed to a removal; the latter want removal but resist the alteration of the constitution."^{*}

The first step of the coalition of the west and the Cape Fear factions was to defeat the appropriation for rebuilding at Raleigh. The debate, which lasted through December, 1831, into January, 1832, was mainly a series of arguments on the propriety of removal and a constitutional convention. Those opposed to the bill, favoring removal and a convention, found their principal argument in the economic value of Fayetteville. Raleigh was but a country town without trade or industry; the legislators there in session received no influence that would remove provincialism and prejudice; as Fayetteville was a commercial centre with a large trade, a removal of the capital to it would bring the members of the Assembly into contact with commerce and give them an acquaintance with its advantages, would stimulate the cause of internal improvements and open a new and larger era in the development of the state's resources. However, the friends of rebuilding at Raleigh had much the stronger arguments; they pointed to the doubtful constitutionality of removal, the violation of public faith with the people of Raleigh who had paid to the state \$62,000 for land lots, the uncertainty of navigation on the Cape Fear, the central location of Raleigh, and the expense of a convention. Although these facts enlisted the best talent of the Assembly, the appropriation bill was defeated, losing in the Commons by three votes. Having prevented rebuilding at Raleigh, the western faction introduced a bill for a convention to revise the constitution and consider the removal of the capital, but it was indefinitely postponed in the Commons, where introduced, by 69 to 56.†

The following session, 1832-33, the coalition of reform and removal failed. A joint committee on reform was appointed. An attempt was made in the Senate to have it consider removal, but it was defeated. The sight of the ruins of the old capitol and the doubt of the legality of sessions not within the city limits of Raleigh were powerful arguments for rebuilding; so the appro-

^{*}Ashe, James Paton (N. C. Hist. Commission).

†The debates on removal and the convention question were published in pamphlet form. I have used the pamphlet edition in preference to the newspapers.

priation bill was carried. Seeing no hope for the success of the convention bill, the friends of reform decided to appeal to the people. A meeting was held on January 4, 1833. Its chairman was General Polk of Rowan. Among those present were some large-minded eastern men, viz. William Gaston of Craven, David Outlaw of Beaufort, Wm. H. Haywood of Wake. Resolutions were adopted that the sheriffs at the next election take the poll for and against a convention and report the vote to the Assembly. A committee to frame an address to the people and committees of correspondence for the various counties were then appointed. Accordingly the vote on the convention issue was taken in 31 counties, the result being 30,000 for a convention and 1,000 against it. The returns were sent to the Assembly by Governor Swain in a strong and effective message. A joint committee on reform was appointed. A majority of its members were from the east, and they were able to force a compromise. The west sacrificed its superiority in numbers by granting that no county should be denied representation in the lower house on account of small population and that no large county should have more than two in the same house. The eastern members, on the other hand, conceded reform not by convention but by legislative initiative. This would throw the movement into the hands of the east which controlled the Assembly. Consequently the report of the committee was not acceptable to a majority of the western members, and it was rejected.

In the meantime the issue of internal improvements had become imperative. The need of better transportation facilities was apparent in all parts of the state. During 1832 and 1833 a number of railroad conventions were held and just before the session of 1833-34, a convention representing 48 counties met in Raleigh. Resolutions were adopted which recommended for the east the connection of Edenton with the Dismal Swamp and of Beaufort Harbor with the Neuse River, and railroads from the Roanoke to South Carolina and from the mountains to the sea. A memorial embodying these plans was presented to the Assembly by the convention, which appeared before the legislature in a body. Here was a measure that would benefit all sections of the state. It was referred to a joint committee of both houses. The Board of Internal Improvements also recommended

some action. Nothing was done because of the clash of sectional interests. The session of the Assembly, an unusually long one, ended with neither the mandate of the people concerning constitutional reform nor that on internal improvements being heeded.

A wave of indignation now swept over the state. The western members held a meeting and appointed a committee to frame an address to the people. A large number of newspapers in the east criticised the lack of action on the part of the Assembly. In the west revolution was threatened. Said the *Carolina Watchman*:—

"If the General Assembly does not submit the inequalities of our constitution to the people in some formal mode, we of the west are determined to go to work without the behest of that body. We admit the experiment is dangerous—if the people were less virtuous, it would be immensely so—but we think the spirit of your fathers which bore them through the trials of the Revolution is still sufficiently with us to secure us against the perils of faction. Mark it, my dear Sir, cost what it will the experiment will be made immediately after the rise of the next Assembly if some measure of reform does not pass.*"

This threat of revolution, the change in the attitude of certain eastern leaders and newspapers, and the demand for a charter of a railroad from Raleigh to Wilmington, to which the west would consent only on condition that the convention question be referred to the people, were effective in the Assembly of 1834-35. A bill providing for a convention to consider specific reforms was submitted to the people for approval. As any change in representation was to be made on the basis of federal numbers, the measure was really a compromise in favor of the slaveholding counties of the east. Yet in the popular vote which was taken in April, 1835, all the eastern counties gave majorities against the convention bill, while all the western counties save Person showed majorities for it. As a majority of the state-wide vote supported the bill, Governor Swain designated Independence Day, 1835, as the time for the convention. Elections having been held for delegates, on the appointed day the most august body in personnel and most powerful in authority since the ratification of the federal constitution met in Raleigh. Its deliberations mark a distinct epoch in the History of North Carolina.

* *Raleigh Register*, July 29, 1834.

The Relation of Agricultural Education to Conservation.

By JOHN H. REYNOLDS,

Professor of History and Political Science in the University of Arkansas.

President Roosevelt said in his address to the governors at the Conservation Conference at the White House: "There is no other question now before the nation of equal gravity with the question of the conservation of our natural resources; and it is the plain duty of us who, for the moment, are responsible, to take inventory of the natural resources which have been handed down to us, to forecast the needs of the future and so handle the great sources of our prosperity as not to destroy in advance all hope of the prosperity of our descendants."

The soil is our greatest natural resource, and agriculture is our most important, as it is our most fundamental, occupation. It occupies the time of over half of the people of the nation and of over two-thirds of the people of the South. Upon the prosperity of the farmer all classes depend. It is a mode of life as well as an occupation; it absorbs the life and thought of the entire family as well as of the bread-winner. Moreover, agriculture stimulates individual initiative and develops a larger independence of character and personal liberty than does any other occupation. Then too, it is capable of almost indefinite expansion and improvement. The mammoth output of the American farm gives dignity and importance to the tiller of the soil. In 1907 the total product of our farms was \$7,412,000,000; in 1908 it was probably about \$8,000,000,000. The crop of 1907 exceeded that of 1906 by \$657,000,000 or 10 per cent; that of 1899 by \$2,695,000,000 or 57 per cent. The total annual production of the farms, the mines, the forests, and the factories is approximately \$25,000,000,000. Of this the farm supplies about one-third.

But in spite of this pleasing picture of the American farm, a real problem respecting the soil confronts the American people. Let us take an inventory and look into the condition of the soil and into the demands which the future will make upon it. What are the material facts in the situation?

In the first place there is no longer an undeveloped West to which our sons and daughters may go for virgin soil when the old farms fail to yield an increase. The old adage, "Go West, young man, and grow up with the country," has served its day. There are no new territories to develop. And the countries beyond the Golden Gate are more densely populated than is our own. Hence American soil must support the present and future population of this country.

We must face the fact that the demands of the present upon the resources of our country are great, while the requirements of the distant future will be enormous. We have now in this country approximately ninety million people; they have already taken up all the better class lands, and, notwithstanding the total farm product (about \$8,000,000,000) staggers us, yet it takes practically all of it to supply home consumption, less than ten per cent being exported. What a population the future may have to feed and clothe! For the last century we have almost doubled our population every twenty-five years. Should we continue to increase as rapidly in the future as in the past, we would have in 1950 a population of 320,000,000; in 2000, 1,280,000,000. Though it is not to be expected that the population of the United States will increase in the future with the same rapidity as in the nineteenth century, we should certainly feel that it is our duty so to administer our natural resources as to leave them in such condition that our posterity can live in comfort and make indefinite progress.

We should remember that our soil is rapidly losing its fertility, and that in the older states are to be found thousands of abandoned farms. Soils, virgin but yesterday, are growing poorer and our hills redder. While per capita the American farmer produces more than any other farmer in the world, yet per acre he produces less. Parts of New England are actually being depopulated. Many sections of old Virginia, once the home of opulent and lordly planters, are now too poor to support the people, who are supplementing the small income from the farm by keeping summer boarders. The commercial fertilizer bill of America is another witness to the growing infertility of the soil. South Carolina's bill last year was ten million dollars, that of Georgia about twelve million, while Arkansas, a new state, expended al-

most a million. The yield of wheat per acre in the great Northwest has declined one-half in the last quarter of a century. France produces one and one-half times as much wheat per acre as does the United States, Germany twice as much, and England two and one-half times as much, though these countries have been under cultivation for fifteen centuries. Between 1880 and 1900, Ohio lands lost in value \$60,000,000. This loss in fertility of the soil is caused by single cropping and by failure to fertilize, that is, to replace the soil elements taken off by erosion and in the form of crops. Of the soil elements necessary to successful crop production the most important are nitrogen, potassium, and phosphorus. Of these the first two exist in large quantities in nature and can easily be replaced when lost from the soil, but phosphorus is limited in quantity. It exists in phosphatic rocks in Tennessee, Florida, Wyoming, and some three other states. The present known sources of supply of phosphorus for commercial fertilizer will not last over a century. In Wisconsin, a new state, a third of the phosphorus in the virgin soil has disappeared. Notwithstanding these facts, we are exporting forty per cent of all phosphatic rocks mined in America. How will posterity replace the lost fertility of the soil when all our phosphorus beds have disappeared?

The exhaustion of our national resources is a menace to free institutions. Writing to an American friend fifty years ago Lord Macaulay said: "As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land your laboring population will be more at ease than the laboring population of the old world; but the time will come when wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as they do with us. Then your institutions will be brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million and another cannot get a full meal.....The day will come when the multitudes of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast or expects more than half a dinner, will choose a legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a legislature will be chosen?" The rest of this picture is entirely too gloomy to present, but the situation above described is not only possible but probable, unless we learn

to make three and four grains grow where one grew before. How much the success of American free institutions in the past owes to our once-thought inexhaustible supply of free virgin lands, to which our fathers could go by moving west, the future stress may reveal. America may soon face what many European and Oriental countries are now passing through—an insufficient food supply. Empty dinner pails and hungry stomachs bring about a condition favorable to the agitator and the demagogue. Hence is it too much to say that in the problem of the conservation of the soil largely lies the destiny of our free institutions? Our country like others will find its day of peril when there is no longer free land for our surplus population. And that day is close at hand. It is to be hoped that our people have discovered this fact soon enough to forestall its consequences. Certainly we have no time to lose.

Summarizing, the situation is that the present population is using practically all the products of the soil, that we are cultivating all the better class lands, that there are no new countries to develop, that our soil is losing in fertility, that the supply of one necessary soil element, phosphorus, is apparently limited, that in the meantime our population is rapidly increasing, and finally it may be said that our free institutions are involved in the solution of the problem of the soil. Hence there is before the American people a question pertaining to the soil. We are face to face with a real issue. It is a problem in which all alike are interested, professional men, business men and laborers, as well as farmers. Hence it is a public, not a private question; it is so big as to require all the resources of both federal and state governments to solve.

What is the significance of these facts? What do they suggest as to our duty? Do they not impose upon us a sacred duty so to use the soil as not only to produce in abundance what we need, but to transmit it to our children uninjured if not improved? Some object to sacrificing in the interest of posterity; they claim that our children should be required to shift for themselves as we have done. But we must not make it impossible for posterity to shift. The reckless use and destruction of natural resources is selfish in the extreme and exhibits the spirit of a certain Bible character who said to his soul, "Take thine ease, eat, drink, and

be merry." I am loath to think that the American people will adopt such a low ethical principle. We should remember that the soil is the gift of God to man and that the people here a thousand years hence will be as much His children as we are. Besides they will be flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone; they will be our children. Shall we recklessly destroy the soil and consign them to a life of hunger, poverty, and misery? Shall we cut off all hope of progress and doom them to pauperism and peasantry? Or shall we regard the soil as a trust to be used so that posterity can carry forward the great progress in the arts and the sciences so auspiciously begun by us? Our duty is therefore clear. We must cease our reckless wastefulness, must so use the soil as to make agriculture profitable, productive, and permanent; profitable, so as to keep the people on the farm; productive, so as to supply all our demands; and permanent, in the interest of posterity.

What is the solution for the problem? Can it be solved? Yes: the solution lies in the conservation of our natural resources, especially of the soil. That scientific agriculture will bring about, and an agricultural education will give us scientific agriculture. Hence the supreme need is a broad agricultural education. Perhaps the greatest educational problem now before the country is the education of the farmer. The old view that the farmer needs no education, that just any one can farm, is wrong, and is partly responsible for the wasteful methods of the past and of the present.

It being agreed that our people should be educated in agriculture, the question of method arises. The movement for agricultural education has reached such proportions that its success is assured; and hence the only remaining question is what form of organization such education will undergo. What should be the elements in an agricultural educational policy for an American state? To be more concrete, what program of agricultural education should the southern states put into operation? What is given below is merely an outline of such a policy:

1. United States Department of Agriculture. The most energetic support should be given to the department of agriculture of the federal government. Our congressmen should be given to understand that the department is backed by the sentiment of the

nation. It is doing a great work in plant and animal breeding and pathology, in seed selection, in forestry, in soils, and in popularizing scientific knowledge through bulletins, farm demonstration, and farm management. It is a great educational as well as research agency. If we can spend hundreds of millions annually for big guns, surely we can expend a few hundred thousand in the interest of the basic occupation of our people.

2. Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations. The people should enlarge the colleges of agriculture and the experiment stations of the several states, and co-operate with them. The station is devoted exclusively to research work, while the college is engaged in teaching agriculture. The function of the station is through experiment and investigation to find a solution for the problems of the farm and through bulletins to carry this information to the public. This work of pushing out into the realm of the unknown and by research extending the domain of knowledge is of the highest and most practical value. A solution for only a few of the many agricultural problems has been found, and, before agriculture can be placed upon a solid foundation, the scientific principles underlying successful farming must be discovered. Before the people can be taught agriculture, there must be something to teach them,—a body of scientific knowledge about the farm. To the experiment station is assigned the task of discovering and supplying this knowledge. On the other hand the function of the college of agriculture is the same as that of the college of engineering or of arts; it is to teach. The need for such work is imperative, and the demand for scientific agriculturists is growing rapidly. They are needed for the farm, for teaching, and for expert governmental service. The call for teachers of agriculture in colleges and secondary schools far exceeds the supply. Normal schools are appreciating the importance of this new field, are establishing departments of agriculture, and are requiring their students to take courses therein. The college of agriculture must be strengthened, if the growing demand by farm, school, and governmental service for scientifically trained agriculturists is to be met.

3. Farmers' Institutes. Another good agency for popularizing agricultural education is the farmers' institutes. They are conducted by the staff of the experiment station and the college of

agriculture. Through this channel the scientific information of the universities is carried directly to the farmer, and the trained minds of experts are brought to bear on the practical problems of the farm. Such work is beneficial alike to the farmers and to the station men. To the farmers it brings valuable information and inspiration, while the experts are brought into sympathetic touch with the real problems of agriculture, their minds are sharpened, and their work is given a practical bent. It is doubtful which is benefitted more by contact, the farmers or the experts.

4. *Agricultural Schools.* The legislatures of Wisconsin, Georgia, Alabama, Arkansas, and other states have provided for separate agricultural schools. This action is in response to a general demand that something be done for agriculture, and probably without very definite ideas as to an agricultural educational policy or as to the place in our educational system which these schools should take. The wisdom of establishing these schools and their permanence are doubtful. The policy of administration pursued will largely determine their fate. They are experiments, and no state is justified in trying more than three or four until their value is determined. A separate set of occupation schools alongside of the public schools involves far-reaching consequences, some of which are heavy financial burdens, possible intensification of class prejudices, stratification of society, and undemocratic tendencies. The schools will be of little service unless they are made a part of a system and are articulated with the schools below and the schools above, especially with the agricultural college of the state.

5. *Agriculture in the High Schools.* Still another agency for popularizing the science of agriculture is through existing and future high schools. It is out of the question for the state to establish a separate set of agricultural schools in sufficient numbers to bring one within reach of every boy and girl. It would bankrupt the state. Besides, even if the proposition could be financed, it would probably be unwise to separate those of our children who will live on the farm from the rest, and educate them in different schools. It would sharpen class distinctions. But such an extreme and expensive policy is not necessary in order to solve the problem of carrying agricultural education to the peo-

ple. It can be done through the public high school. In many states, with and without state aid, courses in agriculture have been introduced into existing high schools. This can be done just as well in high schools with an agricultural environment and constituency, as courses in manual training, mechanics, commerce and business can be introduced into the high schools of our cities with an industrial constituency. Our public school must be made cosmopolitan and must serve its constituency. The state can give the cause of popular agricultural education a most powerful stimulus if the general assembly will appropriate a small sum at first, say \$50,000, and through a state board say to any community, that, if it will provide the necessary high school buildings, teaching force for the regular course, and a small farm for demonstration purposes, and equip a room for domestic economy, the state on its part will provide said school with a teacher of agriculture and domestic economy. Communities with and without high schools would gladly respond to such a proposition, and, in a comparatively short time, each state at a small cost would have a hundred or more of such schools. Sooner or later the movement to consolidate rural school districts and to establish rural high schools will assume larger proportions. Such state aid as suggested above would greatly stimulate the movement, and the South might reasonably expect at no distant day to have many high schools in the country as well as in the towns. This would carry agricultural education to the people.

6. Agriculture in State Normals. As a part of a general agricultural educational policy, each state should establish a strong department of agriculture in connection with its normal school or schools. The reason for this is apparent. We have been educating our children away from the farm. For this, part of the blame lies with our lack of system in training our teachers; for they have never been given an agricultural education so as to develop in them a respect and sympathy for farm life and to enable them to teach agriculture. If agriculture is to be taught and a love for rural life instilled into our children, the fountain head, the teachers, must be properly trained in the science of agriculture. In the future the South will draw her teachers from normal schools, the normal department of her universities, and from her high schools. The normal students at the universities already

have good facilities for their agricultural courses; but our future teachers now in many state normals and in the high schools do not enjoy such advantages, though elementary agriculture is being taught in perhaps all state normals. By equipping the normal schools with strong departments of agriculture and by introducing the subject into the high schools, the teachers of the future will be competent and imbued with the right spirit.

7. Agriculture in the Common Schools. While the children in the grades are not mature enough for such a composite science as agriculture, yet, when the teachers are properly trained, something can be done even in the common schools in the way of instruction in the elements of agriculture. At least nature study and some fixed laws of agriculture could be taught, and along with it practical work in the way of school gardening could be given. However, but little can be done for agriculture in the grades. The time of the pupil in the common schools is taken up with balanced work, that relates alike to country and city life, in acquiring the tools of an education. This must be done before specialization is possible. The violation of such a fundamental law of education would prove disastrous. Most of the rural schools are taught by girls. How much practical agriculture may we expect them to teach? Hence the people must look to other schools and agents to teach scientific agriculture.

8. Special Agencies. In addition other agencies, such as the press, the platform, farmers' organizations, and fairs, county and state, may be utilized in carrying a knowledge of agriculture to the people. Such means are capable of almost indefinite expansion.

But it is urged that such a program of education will involve large expenditures, and that it will cost more than this generation can spend merely to preserve the fertility of the soil for the benefit of posterity. This objection loses sight of the fact that education is an investment not an expenditure, interest-bearing capital not a charity. The marvelous material progress of the nineteenth century is largely due to the democratization of knowledge through the public schools. Why is the wealth of this country in the hands of the white man instead of the black man? Brain power. The fact is that the productive power of a people varies largely with their education; those states that ex-

pend most on their schools produce most. Indeed, there is a remarkably close relation between the per capita products of states and the average length of their schools. Brain power is our best fertilizer. This is true not only of education in general, but it is true of agricultural education in particular. A few years ago California found that the orange crop was being ruined by an insect, the cottony cushion scale. The state and federal governments spent thousands of dollars in trying to discover a method of destroying the insect. Finally Dr. C. B. Riley, of Washington, found a little insect in Australia, the *ladybug*, which would destroy the scale. Ladybugs were imported, scattered among the orange groves of California, and soon the scale disappeared. The expenditure of a few thousand dollars in the study of this question is now yielding as many millions a year in the increased orange crop of California. The Department of Agriculture at Washington hunted the deserts of Asia and Africa over in search of plants suitable for the arid regions of America. A hard wheat was found, brought to this country, planted in the West, and from it last year we realized some 50,000,000 bushels. In Siberia a clover living in temperature six degrees below zero was found. An alfalfa adapted to arid regions was discovered. They are now introducing into the great American desert both the clover and the alfalfa. By better methods of seed selection Iowa has added \$8,000,000 a year to her corn crop.

The State of Wisconsin believes implicitly in the doctrine that education pays. She is proving her faith by her works. She is expending over a million dollars a year on the University. The agricultural college and experiment station receive their share of this amount. Some years ago the station took up the question of corn growing and by experiments in seed selection and cultivation solved the problem. The station staff organized a campaign, and, by bulletins embodying the results of their work and by institutes, they carried this information to the farmers. As a result the corn yield of Wisconsin has increased per acre from fifty to one hundred per cent, or a net gain of some \$6,000,000 annually. Moreover, the station men took up the dairy problem and solved it. They bred up the best dairy cow and in various ways induced the farmers to buy the breed. Then Professor Babcock of the station invented his tester to test the

butter fat of the milk, and Professor Hart his casein tester to determine the casein of the milk for the cheese industry. Upon this work of the experiment station the great dairy industry of Wisconsin has been built. The total annual increase of farm products in that state due to the work of the station is about \$20,000,000.

Without giving further illustrations, the conclusion forces itself upon us that agricultural education pays, that it is an investment better than the stock of any bank, any oil or steel trust. Hence money wisely expended upon it will yield large dividends. While an agricultural educational program will cost, yet no agricultural state can afford not to invest in it. Certainly every state should put as much into productive as into non-productive institutions. Take Arkansas as an example. She is supporting some six non-productive state institutions for the abnormal classes, that is, institutions that, however much is expended upon them, will not yield financial or cultural returns. For these six institutions there was appropriated in 1907 a total of \$1,081,517. She is also maintaining some four or five productive institutions, that is, educational institutions that will produce cultural and financial returns on investments. For these productive institutions the appropriations of the same year amounted to \$270,290. A glance at the figures shows that the state expended about four times as much for non-productive as for productive institutions. Certainly it is time for our educational statesmen to insist that at least as much be allowed for the latter institutions as for the former.

The movement for agricultural education will succeed. Opposition may check it for a time, but those who get in its way will ultimately be run over. This is true because it is a part of that greater movement of American democracy, now over a century old, universal education, a self expansive principle, the hope and heritage of our people. The movement for agricultural education, like that for industrial training, is teaching us a broader view of popular education. As the nineteenth century gave us a deeper and richer meaning of democracy, so are our views of popular education being revolutionized. We are learning that our education is too narrow, is not broad enough at the base, that it is drawing an undue proportion of youths to the professions; that

our education is a misfit, and that it must be articulated with our industrial system. The movement proposes to convert our theory of popular education into a fact, that is to democratize education, to give all a chance. It proposes to make American democracy a reality by making all agricultural and industrial classes efficient.

Conservatism and Progress.

By WILLIAM P. FEW,

Dean and Professor of English in Trinity College.

The southern states have had a peculiar history. Originally settled more largely perhaps than any other part of America by people who in the mother country belonged to the ruling classes, they naturally had a large share in the making of this nation. But for causes that are well understood the early predominance of these states has not been maintained. Through no fault of his own and through no special fault of southern white people, the African negro, that hapless child of evil destiny, broke early upon the scene of American history. And the South has had to pay dearly for the privilege of developing, first through slavery and then in freedom, this backward race into the full blessings of Christian civilization. The price is not yet paid in full, for though slavery, the "one structural error of the fathers," has been destroyed, it is still stupendous and abiding in its curse. Thus the victim of uncontrollable circumstances through so many long years of suffering and hard struggle now comes at last into an era of growth and prosperity,—the South is attracting the attention of thoughtful men everywhere. In this time of change we are beset on all sides with advice and proffered assistance. We are told that we need to be cured of the hookworm; we need a new kind of education for the masses and a different sort of organization of our colleges; we need to change our politics; we need a new religion. In this paper I shall seek to enquire into the relations between conservatism and progress, especially as they concern a people like the southern people today.

As Edmund Burke has pointed out, the legal doctrine of inheritance furnishes a sure principle of conservatism. By our law a son inherits property from his father. He holds the property, uses it, and, if he be wise, improves it and transmits it to succeeding generations. Thus he looks backward to his ancestors and forward to posterity, at the same time being true to both and also true to himself. The doctrine of inheritance does not exclude the principle of improvement; it implies it. It leaves acquisition free, as Burke said, but it secures what has been acquired. This

is the true principle of conservatism: to hold on to the inheritance from the past but keep free to improve it and transmit it to posterity bettered by each generation.

This is the wise method of nature. Change should always be gradual and slow, growing out of the past and into the future. Thus in every stage of human development there would be nothing wholly novel and nothing wholly obsolete; organized society in all its forms and with all its institutions would be a sort of family inheritance, all fit and confederated with themselves. By this process the bad would be constantly eliminated and the good from whatever source constantly introduced. Only by this way of conservative progress can nations travel to prosperity and peace. Spain, once the proudest and most prosperous nation of Europe, by force and persecution for centuries beat down all change and so thwarted all progress. The result has been stagnation and national decay. The French Revolutionists, on the other hand, cut loose from the past and attempted to build anew a civilization that had no basis in the ancient régime. They so staggered the French nation that it has not yet recovered from the shock. In the whirlwind of revolution they sought to build a house that had no foundation. Spain typifies for us false conservatism and France radical change. Both were wrong. Spain tried to stand still, forgetting that time itself, as Lord Bacon said, is the greatest innovator, and time in its course alters things; and it is as bad to be behind the time as to be ahead of the time. In either case the time will be out of joint for the nation. This is the meaning of Bacon's fruitful saying that a forward retention of custom is as turbulent a thing as an innovation. Conservatism may thus become, as it has often become, as disturbing an element in society as radicalism. One is too far behind, the other too far ahead, and neither is of a piece with the age.

Spain did not adapt itself to changing conditions, and so became the laggard nation of Europe. The French Revolutionists found French society constituted in a way that was wholly displeasing to them. Instead of seeking to reform, they overthrew; instead of using the materials of their country which nature and their history supplied them, they demolished the whole social structure and tried to build up in its place one that to them seemed ideally

good but one that was completely divorced from the past of France. The wisdom to preserve and the ability to improve they did not possess. They were iconoclasts and destructionists rather than founders and builders of civilization. A great and enduring nation cannot be built up so, but it must be built on a long historic past. Civilization is not a forced growth or manufactured product but a natural development, and the development must be along lines of its own and not made to form itself on some wholly extraneous model. Any other conception of national progress rests upon inexperience and ignorance.

Likewise each individual, if he be wise, accepts a large share in the accumulated experiences of mankind, and works out his destiny in good part with reference to the time and place in which he finds himself. He cannot create the materials with which he must work, he can only use them, they are the gifts of history. Corresponding to mediæval Spain and revolutionary France, men divide themselves into two classes, conservatives and radicals; and in neither class is found the highest wisdom. Let me illustrate from a sad chapter in American history. From 1830 to 1860 our southern political leaders were too conservative, the moulders of public opinion in the North too radical. Calhoun stood for a literal interpretation of the constitution, he was true to the past, and the logical validity of his position is generally conceded by competent historians today. But the environment in which he and his contemporaries lived prevented a growth in them of the national feeling which circumstances fostered in other parts of the country, and so, while historically correct, they were put into the wrong by the logic of events. The civilization of the nineteenth century was against the institution of slavery, and the institution of slavery was against the civilization of the nineteenth century. We all know this now and we all rejoice at the issue of the civil war, although in the conflict of arms we lost. But our leaders of those days, living in an atmosphere colored by the institution of slavery and tempered by a conservative view of the constitution, did not keep pace with the innovations of time, with the progress of ongoing events. And so they fell out of line with the age. Again, a forward retention of custom, that is, ultra-conservatism, was as turbulent a thing as innovation, that is, radical change. And Garrison, Phillips, and the New England

abolitionists were the radicals, who broke with the past and became the victims of fixed ideas. They were essentially revolutionists, and to make their ideas prevail they were willing to destroy the constitution and overthrow the government. "Extremes in nature equal ends produce." The ultra-conservatives and the extreme radicals were alike disturbing elements. The extremists on both sides went on; and soon there was war and death and mourning in the land. But the extremists did not have their way. Wise leaders, like Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee, were able through storm and blood to guide the nation to its true goal. The government was preserved, the constitution in its main essentials was saved, some of the evils of our civilization were eliminated, and our country goes on to fulfill its mission.

I have thus indicated at some length through the analogy of inheritance what seems to me to be the spirit in which a man or a nation should seek to promote individual or national progress. But what is progress? My conception of progress may, I think, be inferred from the principle of conservatism which I have suggested. If a wise conservatism means the keeping of all that is good in our inheritance from the past, then true progress is the using of this inheritance not in a spirit of blind adherence to the past but with the purpose to improve wherever certain improvement is possible. We may improve upon our inheritance from the past through the introduction of new principles and new elements, or through making advances over what has gone before in knowledge and in the methods of doing things, by studying what has been and what is in order to mould known principles and elements into newer and higher forms. As thus understood, progress is another name for normal and healthy growth; that is, development out of existing conditions into something unmistakably better.

I would define progress, then, as the growth out of existing conditions into something unmistakably better. In the first place, progress means growth. In this world failure to grow or cessation in growth, which scientists call arrested development, leads straight to stagnation and death. Witness Spain and many other communities and individuals that we are familiar with. This growth, in the second place, to be normal and

healthy must be a growth out of existing conditions; it must be the fruitage of a well established past; it must be the flowering of experience. Any other so-called progress produces half-baked radicals that run amuck up and down the earth, that fit nowhere and are fit for nothing, veritable Ishmaelites whose hand is against every man and every man's hand against them, and who for the peace of society might well be driven into the wilderness with their mother, the Hagar of confusion and every evil work. Here belong the French Revolutionists, the fiery-eyed anarchist and nihilist. And finally, the change, if it is to mean progress, must be into something unmistakably better. Here must be our so-called progress fails. All forms of progress are alike in this, that they are all modes of change. Progress always implies change but change does not always mean improvement. Change in itself is not a good thing. Our inherited institutions, beliefs, and customs ought to be kept intact, except in so far as they can be improved. An inordinate love of novelty and an itching newfangledness produce giddy and superficial character. A great structure must rest upon a stable and enduring foundation.

Another reason why we should be cautious in making changes may be inferred from Spencer's well known law of evolution: Every active force produces more than one change—every cause produces more than one effect. This scientific law of progress appears to hold everywhere; and it seems often to happen that the resultant effects may be some good and some bad. The growth of civilization itself is not an unmixed good. We are all familiar with manifold evils of civilization, and some of them would seem to be inherent evils and not excrescences that may be sloughed off with the further growth of civilization, just as according to Macaulay the remedy for the abuse of liberty is not less of it but more. If all change is so beset with dangers and if progress itself may seem almost a doubtful good, we should be very careful to hold tight to the fundamentals of life and adopt change only when it clearly leads to genuine progress and certain human betterment.

The world moves, but it seems in certain of one's moods to move very slowly, and to men of a critical rather than a creative temperament it hardly seems to move at all. How has this mod-

erate degree of progress been attained, and how may continued progress of the race be attained? Progress is never an accident, and it is never a blind onward movement that has no sufficient cause and no intelligible explanation. The world only grows better, even in the moderate degree in which it does grow better, because people wish it to be better and take the right steps to make it better. Man is himself the agent of all his improvement. As John Morley has said, "Society can only pursue its normal course by means of a certain progression of changes, and these changes can only be initiated by individuals or very small groups of individuals." And these changes should be well considered, gradual, slow, and I need hardly add, I think much less radical than Mr. Morley would often have them to be; but it is true that these changes must all come in the future as they have all come in the past through individual initiative and individual effort. This is the doctrine of individual responsibility that needs always to be enforced. The individual cannot safely lose himself in the mass. Each one is solely responsible for himself, his thinking, and his conduct. We have in history inspiring examples of what single men have been able unaided to do.

The southern states as we know them today are the product of an interrupted and broken past. Originally progressive and prosperous, the deadly disease of slavery was early fastened on the body politic. Then came the tragedy of civil war, after which the historical crime of reconstruction, followed by the tedious years of recovery, and, now by a revival of prosperity and hope. From the nature of things, then, our growth has not been a natural or normal growth, and it follows, therefore, that the growth has not been and could not be in all respects wholesome. Without praise or blame for the past or present, the living or the dead, let us, free from reaction and free from radicalism, look our condition squarely in the face, determined to cherish what is good in our civilization, hold fast to it, improve it in all possible ways, and hand it on to those who come after us.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF JONATHAN WORTH. Collected and edited by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton. 2 vols., 1313 pp. [Publications of the North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh, 1909].

In publishing these letters the Historical Commission has made a valuable contribution to the history of the South as well as to that of North Carolina, for Mr. Worth belonged to that class of southerners whose opinions are too often neglected in American history as it is written, viz, the old line Whigs of the upland region. Racially they were mainly of Scotch Irish descent; industrially they were not so dependent on slavery as their neighbors of the seaboard; in their political theories they were strongly nationalistic, and they did their best to stem the tide of secession.

Of this type Jonathan Worth was an excellent example. His family were mainly Quakers and he spent most of his life in Randolph county, a part of the famous "Quaker District," which always displayed remarkable independence in North Carolina politics. After a few years service in the General Assembly, during which he introduced resolutions condemning nullification and was chairman of the committee which framed the Education Bill of 1840, he retired to private life. But in 1858 he was again elected to the Assembly as member of the Senate, and from that time until 1869 he was continually active in public affairs. These ten years were equalled in political importance only by those of the Revolution. The Whig party, which had apparently gone to pieces in 1853, revived, and by his investigation of the management of the North Carolina Railroad Mr. Worth undoubtedly prepared the way for the large Whig vote of 1860. In the early months of 1861 he was a radical opponent of secession, opposing the first convention bill of January on the ground that a convention on federal relations was unconstitutional unless called to consider amendments to the Constitution.

Then after the affair of Fort Sumter and Lincoln's call for troops, Mr. Worth still opposed a convention, proposed an amendment to the convention bill that no action amending the state constitution or confederating with another government should go into effect until ratified by the people, and, on its rejection, he was one of the three men in the Assembly who voted against the original bill.

Thus Mr. Worth clearly opposed the theory and the practice of secession; indeed he refused to be a candidate for the Convention of May, 1861, and, although he cast his fortune with his state, he had no faith in the future of the Confederacy. In 1862 he was elected to the House of Commons by the Conservatives, and, when the state treasurer was turned out of office, he was chosen to take his place. His services as financial executive were marked by faithfulness and ability. It is interesting to note that he did not approve of Governor Vance's methods of securing money by running the gauntlet of the federal blockade, and that he was in sympathy with the disaffection with the Confederacy, commonly known as the Peace Movement, until the spring of 1864. Indeed his letters relating to the demand for peace are among the most interesting in the entire collection of letters and give evidence of the wide extent of that disaffection.

The letters of the period of restoration and reconstruction give many interesting side lights on the political currents of the time. Believing that provisional Governor Holden, with whom he had been intimate during the Peace Movement, was abusing the pardoning power, he became his opponent in the elections of 1865 and was chosen governor. He opposed the Fourteenth Amendment but, after it was ratified, favored its acceptance by North Carolina and a modification of the State Constitution to meet its requirements. When the Reconstruction Acts were before Congress, he contemplated some action before the Supreme Court of the United States to test their validity, but on the advice of eminent authorities refused to take part in the suit brought by Mississippi. When at last he surrendered his office to Governor-elect Holden, his celebrated protest was undoubtedly the survival of another plan to carry the validity of the elections under the Reconstruction acts to the Supreme Court. Of the letters written to him during and after 1865, those of B. S. Hedrick, a refugee from the state in 1856, are by far the most interesting; they reveal the development of political sentiment in Washington, suggest methods of escaping the evils of reconstruction, and show an unusual interest in the affairs of North Carolina.

Lack of space forbids quotations to illustrate the opinions and conditions described in the letters. It is safe to say that not

since the publication of McRee's *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell* has so comprehensive a body of letters relating to North Carolina appeared. The editorial work includes a calendar of letters prefixed to the first volume, an index, and foot notes, all of which are admirably done. That such a collection bearing on a period so full of controversies should be published by a state commission is a sure evidence that the day fast approaches when the history of North Carolina may be written in an impartial spirit, with the best aid that the sources held by the state can give.

WILLIAM K. BOYD.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF NATHANIEL SOUTHGATE SHALER. With a Supplementary Memoir by his Wife. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1909—.viii, 481 pp.

The autobiographical portion of this volume consisting of 212 pages is a most human, helpful, and vitally interesting piece of writing; the memoir by the devoted and appreciative wife is truly supplementary, repeating but little and serving effectually to round out a vivid picture of a singularly fine spirit. Chronicling, as the volume does, the inheritance, the living, the doing, and the environment of one of Harvard's sons who had no small part in shaping the energies of forty odd years into the Harvard of today, it cannot fail to be of engaging interest to Harvard men everywhere, and to others as well who may be interested in the history of the greater educational movements in this country.

Realizing that the individual is a bundle of complex forces which we call inheritances, reacting on our equally complex environment, Dean Shaler sought to give, with the naturalist's instinct for completeness, full credit to every factor entering into his personality together with the facts as to its possible source. With such object in view, he has furnished us a very charming account, all things considered, of his progenitors and intimate contemporaries, portraying their peculiarities faithfully, but interpreting them charitably.

Of so rich a mine of incident, humor, criticism, and interpretation, one can give no adequate conception in so brief a review. It is almost equally difficult to select the most interesting points.

One is, however, especially impressed with the wide range of

vision which was a dominant characteristic of Professor Shaler. Everything of human interest touched a responsive chord in his nature. Of this the scope of the ten pages of titles appended to the volume is convincing evidence. The fact is all the more remarkable, because it was during the earlier years of his connection with Harvard that the German influence on scholarship was felt most keenly;—diseases mild in countries where they are endemic are apt to be acute when they first appear in new territory. In his enjoyment of music, art, literature, and, in his own literary efforts as well,—which indeed show no mean talent in this direction,—the Dean of the Lawrence Scientific School has put the entire scientific fraternity under a lasting debt of gratitude. He has thus furnished concrete evidence that a man may appreciate scientific fact and still be a humanist. The unfortunate statement of Darwin that he in later life had lost an earlier keen appreciation of poetry has been overworked in proving the converse. Catholicity of interest is further shown in the fact that among his intimate friends were numbered many of the men who were then active in solving political, economic, and practical business problems in his native state, Kentucky; in Massachusetts, his adopted home; and in the nation at large.

To one more or less familiar with the Harvard circle of celebrities, there is a sort of malicious delight in the inimitable way in which Professor Shaler shows that they too were but human. To be told that Agassiz failed to grasp the essential truth of Darwinism and its destined all but universal acceptance makes one more tolerant of his own errors in judgment. To be told that Lowell "was the most perfect and most natural poser" he had ever seen, gave the reviewer, at least, something of a shock. The comment on Asa Gray, Longfellow, Jeffries Wyman, Charles T. Jackson, Benjamin Pierce, and others of his colleagues, bears the stamp of good judgment and true insight, for Professor Shaler had the seeing eye of a born observer of men as well as of nature.

To those who are struggling to put scientific training on a firm basis in southern institutions, it may be something of a comfort to know that at Harvard "for many years the upholders of the scientific spirit had to fight every mile of the march toward acceptance. A stream of cold water, directed by the purely academic element, played upon nearly all of his attempts to develop

and enlarge the scope of scientific teaching as well as to make its approaches possible for any but the foreordained. With the aid of his associates, a body of able men, who in some instances were his former pupils, he fought his fight persistently, passionately, and so successfully that at length the value of the natural history courses met with universal recognition."

One closes the book with regret that Professor Shaler's death in 1906 cut short at the civil war period the chapters of this most readable and illuminating autobiography.

JAMES J. WOLFE.

WOMEN AND THE TRADES, PITTSBURGH, 1907-1908. By Elizabeth Beardsley Butler. Volume 1 of the Pittsburgh Survey. Edited by Paul Underwood Kellogg. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1909,—440 pp.

SOCIAL FORCES. FROM THE EDITOR'S PAGE OF THE SURVEY. By Edward T. Devine. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910,—226 pp.

HOUSING REFORM. A HANDBOOK FOR PRACTICAL USE IN AMERICAN CITIES. By Lawrence Veiller. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910,—213 pp.

The first volume of the Pittsburgh Survey, published for the Russell Sage Foundation, is a well-written and liberally illustrated account of the industrial life of the working women of Pittsburgh. It is a picture of modern industrial organization that is calculated to attract and fix the attention not only of the social worker and the economist but also of that individual who is being frequently mentioned of late, "the ultimate consumer." Few consumers will fail to be interested in learning of the conditions under which their crackers, candy, pickles, stogies, ready-made garments, lamp chimneys, and sundry other goods are produced. And such knowledge ought to array them on the side of fair treatment for the thousands of working women who are parts of the many-sided organization which caters to the needs of the public. Social workers will give this first volume a warm welcome and will eagerly await those to follow.

Two other excellent books in the field of social reform are Dr. Edward T. Devine's "Social Forces" and Mr. Lawrence Veiller's "Housing Reform." Dr. Devine's book contains twenty-five selected editorials which have appeared in *The Survey*. Together

they present his modern social creed and look forward to the establishment of a social order "in which ancient wrongs shall be righted, new corruptions foreseen and prevented, the nearest approach to equality of opportunity assured, and the individual re-discovered under conditions vastly more favorable for his greatest usefulness to his fellows and for the highest development of all his powers."

Mr. Veiller's book on the housing problem is brought out in the belief that it will be of direct service in encouraging preventive legislation in every state in the union. It used to be believed that bad housing had to do only with six-story tenements in New York, and possibly Chicago. We know now that this is not true. The crowding per room, the dirt, the bad water, the disease, the moral conditions, are often just as bad in a few parts of a small city, or even a village. Such a work as this will be of the greatest value in furnishing arguments and imparting practical tactics to those everywhere who are enlisted in the cause of housing reform.

G.

THE BREED AND THE PASTURE. By J. Lenoir Chambers. Charlotte, N. C.: Stone and Barringer Company, 1910,—125 pp.

This little volume comes from the pen of a versatile business man who has been moved to write for his children and circle of friends some intimate sketches of the home and people from whom his family has sprung. The pasture is the town of Evanston—which the informed will perceive to be Morganton. The breed has produced many of North Carolina's ablest men. One can read behind the lines and recognize some of the characters. When the author writes of the Arnolds, it is clear that the Averys are intended; and especially interesting are the pages about young "Ellison Arnold" whose brilliant career came to so untimely an end. The pages of this book are full of a life sweet and wholesome, though in some respects provincial and limited. To read these sketches of other days, is to understand better the past of the South. The memory of this old life is, and should be, a cherished possession of those of the breed who have gone out to live in new pastures.

W. H. G.

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS: HIS LIFE, PUBLIC SERVICES, PATRIOTISM, AND SPEECHES. By Clark E. Carr. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1909,—xii., 293 pp.

One of the notable achievements of biographical writing during recent years has been the rehabilitation of Stephen A. Douglas. In 1908 appeared Professor Allen Johnson's "Stephen A. Douglas," the first extended biography of the half-forgotten rival of Abraham Lincoln. In 1909 Professor P. O. Ray published his "Repeal of the Missouri Compromise," which threw fresh light on the most important measure with which Douglas was identified. In comparison with these studies, the book of Mr. Carr is disappointing. He adds no new interpretation of Douglas's political career or the section of the country he represented. Its value is that of a memoir, the reminiscent story of one who lived during the exciting times of Douglas's career, and who was personally acquainted with him. Such a narrative is really a source for the use of a biographer, not a finished interpretation of its subject for reference by the general reader.

The author's account of Douglas embraces 143 pages; the remaining 150, the index excepted, consist of selected speeches and one letter of Douglas, with a reprint of an article on Douglas's position in the debate with Lincoln at Freeport. The sources from which these speeches are taken, whether *Congressional Globe* or newspapers, are not given. The illustrations, which include portraits of many public men of the times, are a distinctive feature of the book.

W. K. BOYD.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF GERMAN LITERATURE. BASED ON GOTTHOLD KLEE'S "GRUNDZUGE DER DEUTSCHER LITERATURGESCHICHTE." By George Maddison Priest. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909,—366 pp.

As the title indicates, this is not an original contribution to the discussion or interpretation of German literature. It represents rather an effort to provide for young students of German literature a clear but concise survey of the entire field. It is provided with a literary map of Germany, a complete index, and a chronological table of German authors and their works. As a supplement to the lectures of teachers on important movements and great periods in German literature, this handy reference book will, therefore, doubtless prove very useful and convenient.

W. H. WANNAMAKER.

INTRODUCTION TO ECONOMICS. By Alvin S. Johnson. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1909,—xii., 404 pp.

One is prone to open a new text-book with scant enthusiasm and often to dismiss it with a cursory consideration. But the merit of Professor Johnson's "Introduction to Economics" should save it from such treatment. The reader must be struck with the logical character of the presentation of the principles of the science and with the admirable lucidity of statement. Emphasis is placed upon the theoretical aspects of the subject, but the author has furnished considerable illustrative material and the well trained teacher will find no difficulty in supplying as much more as is desirable. The section headings in italics will prove helpful for class room purposes.

Professor Johnson does not confuse the beginner with discussions of controverted points in theory. Such matters are properly left for more advanced courses. He presents the views which seem to him on the whole soundest and most teachable. Many of the chapters, moreover, are of a quality which will make them useful to all who are interested in economic questions—practical or theoretical. Especially able is the treatment of modern industry and industrial conditions. The chapter on monopoly price is one of the best. This work has so much to commend it that it should take high rank among the available text-books of economic science.

W. H. G.

The John Lane Company has published a volume entitled "Mental Discipline and Educational Values" by Professor W. H. Heck of the University of Virginia. Educators will be interested in this able discussion of the comparative disciplinary value of the studies in the school course.

A *North Carolina Library Bulletin* has recently been inaugurated by the State Library Commission, of which Dr. Louis R. Wilson is chairman. This publication will appear quarterly and undoubtedly has a large field of usefulness in building up interest in libraries throughout the state.

